



A

DEFENCE

OF OUR ARGUMENTS

against kneeling in the act of receiving the Sacramentall elements of bread and wine
impugned by Mr.
Michelson.

CYPRIANVS. lib. 2. epist. 3.

E*T de hoc quoque ad collegas nostros
litteras dirigimus, ut ubique lex e-
uangelica, & traditio dominica seruetur,
et ab eo quod Christus et docuit, et fecit,
non recedatur. Quæ ultra iam contem-
nere, et in errore pristino perseuerare,
quid aliud est, quam incurrere in ob-
iurgationem Domini.*

Imprinted Anno. M D C XX.

DE CONSECRATIONE

dist. 2. c. 3. Cyprianus

Cæcilio.

SEd vide frater charissime si quis de antecessoribus nostris vel ignoranter, vel simpliciter non hoc seruavit et tenuit, quod nos Dominus, et exemplo et magisterio suo docuit, potest simplicitati eius de indulgentia Domini venia concedi: nobis vero non poterit ignosci, qui nunc a Domino admoniti et instructi sumus.

BUt see, most dear brother, if any of our antecessours either through ignorance or simplicity, hath not kept, or holdē that which our Lord taught us, both by his example, and precept, his simplicitie may be pardoned of the Lords indulgence, but we cannot be pardoned, who are now admonished and instructed.

TO THE READER:

I Have found nothing (good Reader) in Mr. Michelsons confutation worthe of any answere, but that which is borrowed from D. Morton or D. Denison, and hath been already answered in Perth assemblie. What is his owne, is new, but so absurd, that justlie he hath deserved the change of his surname frō Michelsone to Nihilstone. The judicious Reader may finde as much in Perth assemblie untouched, as may serve for defence of that which he hath lightly touched: and may find further in the Solution of D. Resolutus his resolutions for kneeling. I have now added this defence of our reasons, not so much for reply to his confutation (for that was needlesse) as for illustration, and confirmation of that which hath been already written in the two former, and to obviate such cavillations, as perhaps may be used by some other of our opposites. I will keep the same order, which our Antagonist hath set downe: howbeit he hath divided our arguments, to make them seeme the weaker, as Medea rent, and scattered the members of her brother, that thereby she might the more safely flee: which fault Peter Martyr objected to Gardinerus. His arguments for kneeling shal be answered in the defence of our reasons, as occasion shall offer itself: for his answers and arguments are all alike, and of equall strength. I will also, so farr as I may, eschew repetition of any thing already written in the two former treatises, and present this argument: yet so that this Defence shalbe, as I hope, sufficient without them. Mr. Michelsone hath chosen a worthy Patron to his Pamphlet, my Lord of Scoone. The one kept the doore sometime, when the other did execute the ordinance of the high Commission. Such lipps, such

A 2

lecture.

To the Reader.

lecture. He hath given so notable prooffe of profound knowledge in Divinitie, and subtiltie in handling this controversie in this worthie work of his, that the Bishop of St. Andros, (a man as voyd of learning, as of good manners,) hath made him a Doctor. He hath been forning at the Treasurers gates for his wages, but he will not rest contented, till he get that which he gapeth for, a fatt bishoprik, the hope wherof will sharpen the witt of very mules and asses, lett be of so fine a witt, as Doctor Michelson hath.

P. A. for Perth assemblie.

Sol. for Solution of Doct. Resolutus resolutions.



DEFENCE OF OUR

I. ARGUMENT.

THE gesture of our Lord, and his Apostles, at the Paschall Supper, was a kind of sitting gesture. The same gesture was continued at the Eucharisticall Supper. For whilst they did eat, to wit, of the second service of the Paschall Supper (and consequently whilst they did sit) Christ took bread, and gave thanks, Math. 26. 26. Mark. 14. 22. This collection is so cleere, and evident, that the Papists themselves, hore persecuters for kneeling, doe acknowledge the same. Cardinall Baronius; *(a) That Matthew sayth, And as they were eating Iesus took bread, and blessed; and Mark saith, And as they did eat Iesus took bread, and blessed, and brak it. it is all one, as if they had sayd, whilst they were sitting. But Matthew and Mark, sayth our new made Doctor, must be interpreted by Luke and Paul, who do say, that Christ did institute the Sacrament after they had supped, Luk. 22. 19. 1. Cor. 11. 24. I answer, that Paul and Luke speak of the cup, and not of the bread, Likewise after Supper, he took the cup, and blessed. Likewise, that is, hee gave thanks, as he had done before, when hee took the bread. Neither Paul, nor any of the Evangelists do say, that after hee had supped, hee took the bread, as they doe of the cup. This difference of speech made Bellarmine (b) to follow their opinion, who thought, that Christ consecrated, and*

(a) Annal. tom. 1. an. 34. num. 44. Vnde quod dicit Mattheus, cœnantibus autem eis accepit Iesus panem, & benedixit, & quod Marcus ait, & manducantibus illis accepit Iesus panem, & benedicens frequ: idem est ac si dixisset, recumbentibus illis.

(b) De Eucharist lib. 4. cap. 27.

(c) Tom. 4. l.

3. c. 2. Qua

vis autē totū

Sacramentū

post cœnam

institutum

fuerit, in ip-

sus tamen

cœna sine in-

stitutum est,

eum adhuc

discumbentē,

& manduca-

rent. Nam

manduca-

runt cibos a-

lios quosque

ad institutio-

nem cœlestis

cibi ventum

est. Ideoque

Matth. &

May. autem,

manducanti-

bus ipsis es-

fectum esse

hoc Sacra-

mentū. Ad-

huc enim

manduca-

bant, cum Dominus accepit panem, benedixit, & fregit.

distributed, the bread, in the very time of the Legall Supper, whilst they were eating of it, and that after other actions interve-ning, and the Supper ended Christ took the cup. There is no necessitie to collect such a disjunction of so heavenly a mystérie; but the common opinion is to be retained, that this Mystérie was instituted *per modum unius signi*, in one continued action. Alwayes wee may see, that the bread being consecrated, and distributed, and eaten, before Christ took the cup, justly it may be said, that after supper he took the cup, seeing now the first halfe of this holy action was ended, and had interveined between their eating of the Paschall Supper, and the taking of the cup. Put the case that Luke and Paul had said that after Supper he took bread, their words must so interpret Matthew and Mark, as that there be no contradiction. Christ took bread whilst they were eating, and yet notwithstanding after they had supped, because they were now closing vp their eating, and Christ entred in another action. Barradius the Iesuit (c) saith, *Howbeit the whole Sacra-* ment was instituted after supper, yet it was institu-
ted in the end of the supper, while as they were yet
sitting, and eating: for they eat other meat, till
the time of the institution of the heavenly food;
and therefore Matthew and Mark say, that the Sa-
crament was instituted, while as they were eating:
for they were yet eating, when the Lord took
bread, blessed, and brake. Thus much for the
first

first collection of the sitting gesture of Christ and his Apottles at the Eucharisticall Supper, upon which all interpreters ancient and moderne haue builded. Suppose the first collection should faile, this second collection following will proue it. It behooved them either to sit, stand, or kneele. Stand they could not, for the beds joyned to the table would not suffer that gesture. They did not kneele; for if Christ had changed the ordinarie gesture of sitting at the Paschall supper, into kneeling at the Eucharisticall, a gesture of adoration, and no table gesture, then kneeling had been instituted and not left indifferent, and arbitrarie: For to what end should Christ have changed the one in the other, except it had been his will to have it observed, as other changes made in passing from the last act of the Paschall supper to the Eucharisticall. But our opposites dare not say, that kneeling was instituted. If therefore they neither kneeled nor stood, it followeth that they sate. Never man was so impudent as to call this in doubt, till within these two or three yeares by past, that two or three hirelings have done it.

In the Apostles times the gesture of sitting was continued in the Kirkes: for the lovefeasts and the Lords Supper were so neere conjoynd in time, howbeit different in mysterie, that Casaubone (d) saith, the whole action consisting of the sacred and common banquet, was called by Paul the Supper of the Lord from the better part. Augustine affirmeth that

(d) Exercit.
16. p. 511.
Paulus 10.
tam illam
Corinthiorū
actionē, quæ
sacro & cō-
muni convi-
vio consta-
bat, a potiori
parte vocat
Cænam Do-
minicam.
Tom. 1. An.
57. Num.
130. Corin-
thios autem
inter cænan-
dum miscen-
tes sacra cō-
munibus,
quod correx-
it Paulus,
Eucharistiā
sumere cō-
suevisse. Au.
epist. 118. ad
Ianuariū af-
firmat.

(e) Num. 136. scriptu a Philone convivium sacris videtur admixtu quale illud Pauli ad Corinthios. the Corinthians not onely conjoyned, but also confounded them; and so doth Baronius the Cardinall vnderstand him, when he saith; *Augustine ad Ianuariu[m] epist. 118. affirmeth, that the Corinthians used to take the Eucharist at supper, mixing sacred things with common, which the Apostle corrected.* And afterward (e) he sayth, that the feasting described by Philo seemeth to have been mixed with sacred purposes, like that of which Paul writeth in his epistle to the Corinthians. Now at that frugall feasting wherof Philo maketh mention, they sate on the ground upon mattes made of flagges, and their feasting was intermixed with hymnes and praises. Howsoever the Corinthians abused this holy action otherwayes, yet this intermixing declareth the usuall conjunction of the two parts, or actions. They being then in the Apostles time so neerely conjoyned in time, and distinguished onely in myserie, it behooved them to sit at the one part, as they sate at the other: and so doth Bishop Bilson affirme (f). The practise of many Kirks after the Apostles times, even till Augustines daies argueth, that they sate in the Apostles times. Bullinger, (g) from the different manner of celebrating this holy Supper related by Augustine, observeth as followeth: *Whence that rite is flowd unto us, by which even as yet in Cathedral Churches, and the Monasteries of the Benedictines, on the day called The Supper of the Lord, before good friday, the Supper of the Lord is celebrated openly, and with great pompe: For the Gospell according to John is read publikly by*

(f) Obedience pag. 461.

(g) De origine error. circa cœnam cap. 4. Vnde nimirum ritus ille ad nos dimanavit, quo vel hodie in Cathedralibus ecclesiis & monasteriis Benedictinorum in die Cœna Domini ante pasceuen Cœna Domini palam & splendidius celebratur. Nam Evangelium Iohannis &

the Deacon, and these most sweete conferences of Christ, which he being to depart had with his disciples are rehearsed. In the mean time the tables being set in order, the banquetters sit down to them breaking unleavened bread, and reaching the cup to other, and so everie way representing the trace of the ancient Supper. This footstep of the ancient custome yet remaining amongst the monasteries of S. Bennets order, and observed upon Maundy Thursday; Morneus also observeth. See the Solution of D. resol. resolutions. (h).

Our first Argument then against kneeling in the act of receiving the sacramentall elements is drawn from the example of Christ and his Apostles at the first institution; and the practise of the primitive Kirks following in the Apostles times. Their gesture was not a gesture of adoration in the act of receiving, but a Table gesture. for it was a sitting gesture they used, and not kneeling. Christ instituted Baptisme, but wee read not that he baptised in his own person. But in this Sacrament hee was not onely institutor, as Lord, but also celebrated as a Minister, and set down a most exact and perfect paterne of celebration. The practise of the Apostles following the same order is a direction to us to follow the same also.

We reason likewise from this example and practise against any other gesture which is not a Table-gesture, howbeit not with the same force, as against kneeling. There is eating with walking (as Pios the Monk did, who said hee would not make a worke of

Diacono publice prælegitur. & dulcissima illa colloquia Christi, quæ abiturus cum discipulis habuit, recitantur: interim ordine dispositis mensis convivæ assident, panem azimum frangentes, & calicem invicem propinantes, & in totum veteris cænæ vestigium præferentes.

(h) p. 12. 27

of eating his meate) but this is no table-gesture. To stand in the act of receiving, and then passe by, as in some Churches they do, is not a table-gesture. For there is no more use of a Table in this case, when the communicant standeth, & taketh out of the ministers hand, more then of a cupboord, or dresser, suppose it were never so long. For so it serveth onely to the setting on of the elements, that from thence they may bee reached by the hand of the Minister to the Communicant. A table of as short dimensions, may serve to that use, at the Papists require of necessitie for their Altar to hold up the foot of the Chalice, and so much of the plate, as may keep it from falling, together with the Masse-book, and the candle.

We reason thirdly from the same example and practise, but with least vehemencie, against other table-gestures also, as standing about the table; because it is not agreeable to the first paterne and practise. It was not *cena stataria*, aut *ambulatoria*, but *accubitoria*, which Christ and his Apostles celebrated: not a standing or walking, but a sitting supper. But to returne to kneeling, I conclude with the words of Calvin, who sayth, That they are sure that they swarve not from Gods commandement, who take the sacrament as God hath commanded without adoration. They have the example of the Apostles, who prostrate not themselves but took sitting. They have the practise of the Apostolicall Kirks, &c.

(i) *Instit. lib.*
4. cap. 17.
S. 35.

(k) *Contra*
Harchium.
Scilicet, quā

truly to be adored as God, and as God and

man at table did institute this holy Supper, that the disciples arose, to the end that falling on their knees, they might receive that bread and wine out of his hand: and so like as the Apostles were ignorant how to deliver to the Kirks the manner of celebrating these mysteries.

*ipse adstant
ad mensam
Dominus, ve-
re adorandus
qua Deus,
& qua Dei*

et homo simul cenam instituebat, surrexerunt singuli discipuli, ut in genua procumbentes, panem illum & vinum illud ex ipsius manibus acciperent: & ignorabant scilicet ipsi Apostoli quo ritu deinde celebranda mysteria ecclesie traderent.

It is objected first that if this argument be good then the minister should teach sitting, because Christ taught sitting. But the case is not alike. For the Lords supper is a rituall action, and a visible object is presented before the communicant. Christ taught us by his example, how to behave our selves in such a case. Next, Christ taught sometime standing, sometime sitting, according to the opportunity of time and place. He sate in the mount, Mat. 5. he stood in the plain, Luk. 6. Paul stood up and made his exhortation in the synagoge, Act. 13. He that prophesied stood up, 1. Cor. 14. 30. as Cajetan doeth collect. (1) The originall word signifieth, that the other prophet who was not in the act of prophesying, was sitting, not sitting by. Lastly, this objection may be retorted upon themselves, That seeing Christ and his Apostles and all teachers and hearers in all ages after ward, did not preach or heare preaching kneeling, we can have no warrant to do it. If not at delivery or receiving of the word, then also not at the delivery or receiving

*(1) Audientes sedere,
prophetantes stare significat dicendo,
Quod si alij sedenti.*

ving of the sacramentall elements.

It is objected next, that Christ and his Apostles sate not at the paschall supper after our manner of sitting, and that it was rather a lying then a sitting, as the originall words *anakeisthai* and *anapiptein* do import. It hath been answered already (m) that it was not totally lying, but partly sitting, partly lying, and translated sitting, not lying, by the English translators. Yea the holy Ghost doth expresse this same gesture also by the word sitting in the originall language, *Ezech. 23. 41.* That kind of gesture, (whether brought in among the Iewes by the Romans or Persians, or if it was as ancient as the dayes of David or Salomon, as some do collect out of *1. Sam. 9. 12. Prov. 7. 14. 16. Cant. 1. 12.* it is not materiall) succeeded in the roome of upright sitting, and hath given place again to the same, as answering analogically to it. It was in Christs time the received manner of sitting, and no further is required of us but to observe the received gesture of the country, where we are. It is also to be observed that *anakeisthai* and *anapiptein* are not the proper vocables to expresse this kind of gesture, as Athenæus doth testify. (n) Beza in Math. 8. 11. sayth, that *anaclineisthai* is put there for *cataclineisthai* the proper greek vocable of this gesture. Farther, howbeit in a private parlor a small number did sit after that manner at the first paschall supper, yet it is no way probable, that in the Christian assemblies afterward in Corinth, Ierusalem, or elsewhere, they sate after the same manner. For howso-

(m) P. A.
pag. 38.
Sol. pag. 9. 6.

(n) Lib. 1.
cap. 18.

ever there is mention made in ancient writers of houses of 60. 80. or 100. beds, that was not common, but peculiar to princes and great men. Plutarch (o) noteth it as a (o) *Symposi* vice in a man to build houses for 30. supping *fla s.* beds, or above. Shall we then think, that the Apostolicall Kirks had the use of such houses for their meetings, or that the Lords supper could be celebrated in such a form in their numerous assemblies.

It is thirdly objected, that if we be bound to the imitation of Christ, and his Apostles gesture, by as good reason we shall be bound to the imitation of the time and place; that is, to celebrate after supper, and in a private house. It is answered that the circumstances of time and place of the first supper were onely occasionall, and the occasion of them was unavoydable because of the law of the passeover. But the gesture might be easily changed by Christ without violation of Gods law, namely seeing the paschall supper was ended. It was as easie to them to goe to their knees, as to the Egyptian Naucratis after they were set downe to their feasts, when they began to sing hymnes to their gods. But our Lord would keep the same forme at the Eucharistlicall supper, which hee kept at the paschall. Our Doctor sayth, that the Apostles retained these circumstances, and changed them not. I answer, if that were true, we have no reason, nor warrant to doe otherwise. Next, if the Apostles retained these circumstances upon occasion, and not for imitation, upon necessitie, & not voluntarily,

voluntarily, then he hath gained nothing. For we deny not, that in times of persecuti-
on, or when occasionally there falleth out
any necessity, we may celebrate in the night,
and in a private house, where the Church is
assembled. The Apostles would not have
been suffered to celebrate the supper in the
temple, as sometime they were overseen to
teach. Next, it was not so fit for the cele-
bration of the Lords supper, as for the prea-
ching of the word. The first was ordeined
onely for the believers: the last, to convert
also unbelieving Iewes. Thirdly, there is
no likelihood that they celebrated ever at
night. For howbeit at Troas Act. 20. it were
granted to have been celebrated at mid-
night, as some do call it in question, yet who
seeth not, that it was then d layed to that
time, not because it was the usuall time, or
for imitation of the institution but onely up-
on occasion. The Apostle being to depart,
did continue preaching, and so that action
was continued. The Centurie vvriters doe
not affirme, that the Corinthians did cele-
brate after supper, but onely say videtur, that
it seemeth so. But Chrysostome (p) affirmeth
the contrary, that they did celebrate in the
morning. It is sayd Act. 2. 46. that they conti-
nued daily with one accord in the temple, and brea-
king of bread from house to house. Patæ is sayth,
(q) that the Apostles did not adstrict themselves
to the evening, but occasionally ministred the Sup-
per, sometimes in the day time, as Act. 2. 46. some-
times late in the night, as Act. 20. whereby they
shew that the time of the Supper is indifferent.

(p) Homil. 7.
in 1. Cor. 11.
(q) De sym-
bol. & rub.
eucharist. p.
152. Neque
Apostoli ad
tempus ves-
pertinum sese
adstrinxerūt,
sed pro occa-
sione cenam
administra-
vunt, aliis di-
urno tēpore,
ut legere est,
Act. 2. 46.
alias intēpes-
ta nocte, ut
act. 20. Quo
facto satis o-
stenderunt
tempus cenæ
per se esse
indifferens.

TO the due ministration of the Lords Supper there is required a table, whereabout the communicants are to be placed. It a table, then also a table gesture; kneeling is not a table-gesture. Therefore kneeling is not a fit gesture for this Supper. A table is so requisite to this action, that from a table this supper hath received one of the scripture names, that is, to bee called the Lords table, to distinguish it from common tables. As it is called breaking of bread, because that rite was usuall in the celebration of this sacrament. By this reason, sayth the Doctor, it should be celebrated at evening, because it is called the Lords Supper. It is true, that in our language, this word, Supper, signifieth onely the evening meale, but not so in the originall. For the word *Deipnon* in ancient Greeke writers signifieth indefinitely the repast that a man taketh any time of the day, yea suppose it were before the rising of the sunne, as may be seen in Homer the Greek Poet. The banquet or feast which Luk. 14. is called *Deipnon*, is called *ut videtur*, *significans*, *Mat. 22. Ariston*. Casaubonus (*r*) observeth out of Photius, that Paul called this Sacramentall Banquet *Deipnon*, according to the *priscu sem-* *poris. omnia* of the word in Pauls time; meaning that all *convivia* *appet-* *banquets* were called *Deipna*, howbeit they were not *lata deipna*, *etiam quae* at the end of the day. He confirmeth this in the *non fierent*, *in fine die,* page following, when hee sayth, that the *castes* of idolatours in their temples were al-

So called *Deipna* not *Arista*. Read *Concilium Ancyranum*, where yee shall also find these idolatrous feasts expressed by this word *deipnon*. The word which was ever used to signifie that which we call Supper, is *dorpos*, or *dorpon*. Casaubonus giveth also this reason of the name, That it is called a Supper, rather then a dinner, because of old they dined sparingly and supped more liberally, to signifie the plenty and liberality of this feast. Other allegoricall reasons of this name I omit. To returne then, not onely was this feast called the table of the Lord, but also it had a table indeed, not onely in the Apostles time, but also many ages afterward, both for consecration and distribution. Now it was not a money-changers, or writers table, but *mensa convivialis* a feasting table which Christ and his Apostles used, and not without some profitable consideration. For a Table was counted sacred of old by the Ethnicks, and they thought the gods were present there at their feasts (f), and likewise the Poets bring in sometimes their gods feasting at a table. There is a notable sentence of Ben Syra *Mensa parata, sive pefisa contentio tollitur*, the table being prepared and set, contention ceaseth, signifying that the communion of one table betokened reconciliation, and loue. The Iewes say, that when some alteration arose in the house of Ishboseth the son of Saul, the servant incontinently spread the Table, and the alteration ceased. It at prophane feasts, a table was counted sacred, and a symbole of concord and fidelity.

(f) *Ante
focos olim
longis consi-
dere mensis
Mos erat,
& mensa
credere ad-
esse Deos.
Ovid. fast. 5.*

lity, far more at this sacred feast, which is a banquet of Loue. Musculus therefore is not to be commended for his saucie censure of the laudable custome of the reformed Churches, where are, and hath been so many worthies: I will forbear comparisons. Luthers testimonie set down by Musculus in that same place is memorable. *Therefore Christ so instituted the Sacrament that in it we should sit at Table. But all things are changed, and the idle ordinances of men are come in the place of Divine Ordinances.* Musculus himselfe on Matth. 26. 23. observeth in the ancient Proverb *Mensam & salem non transgredi*, that the Table was counted sacred, and a symbole of friendship. And deploareth the corruptions of our times, wherein neither the fellowship at the prophane, nor mysticall Table, maketh us mindfull of this durie. And in his Common Places (1) he saith, that to a sacrifice belongeth an Altar, to the communication of the sacrifice a Table. A feasting Table then being granted, the gesture of Kneeling, being no Table-gesture, must be excluded in the act of banquetting, which is the proper use of the Table. The Christians under the ten persecutions, it is true, could not haue the commoditie of high tables, and seates answerable. But it is neither the height, nor the matter that we stand upon. Whether the table be round, square, or extended in length: whether it be of timber, or stone; of a bull hide, or a plot of ground: whether it be high or low; the forme and fashion of a table ought to be observed, that the

(1) *De cœna Domini pag. 345. Sacrifici-
us competens
ara, commu-
nications sa-
crificii com-
petit mensa.*

Communicants may communicate tablewise: Whether they convene in dens, or deserts; in Kirks, or houses. Wine is one of the Sacramentall elements, and yet Volaterranus writeth that the Priests of Norway were permitted to consecrate in other liquor then wine, because wine could not be kept in that Northern Country. So a plot of ground whereabout men sit and feast, answereth analogically to the high table. As for private consecrations in time of persecution, like that of Lucianus the Martyr who used his breast for an Altar, when he was in prison: or for keeping the Sacrament, and communicating a part, belonging to the controversie of private consecrations, and private communions, to be enquired, whether they did right or not. Wee are now speaking of Assemblies, and Congregations, whether in time of peace, or under persecutions. See further of this second

(v) pag. 16.
18, 34-35.

Argument in the answer to D. Resolutus. (v)

Defence of our third Argument.

CH R I S T said in the plurall number, *Take ye, eat yee*, not *take thou, eat thou*, in the singular number, as the minister speaketh to the communicant kneeling. He produceth Musculus, saying that Christ gave the bread to every one of the Apostles severally. But the same Musculus acknowledgeth that Christ gave the cup to the need

rest, and not to every one severally. Now as Christ sayd, *take ye, drink yee all of this*, so he said, *Take yee, eat yee*. Gabriel Biel (x) Swarez (y) the Iesuit, and Cajetan (z) have devised another forme, which will sort better with the phrase of the Evangelists. To wit, That Christ did breake the bread in so many peeces, as there were communicants, layd them in a plate, and reached the plate to them, saying, *Take ye, eat ye*. And as for the cup, they acknowledge it was given onely to the nearest, and that the words were so spoken generally to all. The Doctor saith, that Christ spake first generally, *Take ye, eat ye*, and then he gave the bread to every one of them severally. Otherwise (saith he) Christ should have given the bread before it was a Sacrament, meaning before hee had said, *Thi is my bodie*. But I would demand, if Christ said first generally, *Take yee, eat yee, thi is my body*, if he said againe, *Take thou, eat thou, thi is my body*, when hee gave to every one severally: as many of the schoolmen adstricting the power of consecration, as they call it, to the five words, *Hoc est enim corpus meum*, do feine, that Christ spake these words twice. Which Swarez refuteth; (a) because it changeth the order of the text set down with so full consent of Paul and the Evangelists, no reason enforcing them so to do. Or did Christ in giving severally, utter the Gregorian prayer, or what said he? Likewise when he gave the cup, he behooved according to his imagination first say generally, *Take ye, drink ye all*

(x) *Left 36.*
in Can. missa
 (y) *Tom 3.*
p. 702. 902.
 (z) *In Mat.*
 26.

(a) *Tom. 3.*
p 702 vbi
na. la ratio
cozit, non o-
portes (ordi-
nem tex us)
mutare pre-
sertim cum
ab Evange-
listis. &
Pa lo tanta
conferfione
obfervatus
fit.

of this, *This cup is the new Testament, &c.* and then give it severally to every one; and then what said he? Did he repeat the same words: or utter the Gregorian prayer for the cup, or what said he? Is not this Popish shifting of the Doctors, violence done to the text. As if the text were not cleer of itself, that Christ in the very act of giving did joyn the words of promise, *this is my bodie*, to the element consecrated before by prayer, and

(b) *Ibid.* 7. then they eate of it. Swartz without any violence done to the text, saith better, agreeing with his device of distributing the bread, when he saith (b) *After the Lord had taken the bread, and blessed it, hee divided it in a sufficient number of peeces, and ordered them in the Plate, and reached them to his Disciples, saying the words of consecration, which being finished, every one received his own part, and communicated.* What is further alledged by the date posuit, D. But against this third Argument, shall be answered in defence of the fourth reason, as in a place more convenient.

The Doctor casteth by, in a dark corner, two of our reasons, as not worthy to be answered, or ranked in order, & number with the rest. First we say, that where kneeling is in use, the Sacramentall breaking after thanksgiving is not enjoyned, so far as we can find in their Service books, when as other rites invented by man are enjoyned.

(c) *De symbolo* And for practise, *Paræus* testifieth that the Lutherans have it not, but have the bread cut in small peeces before it be brought to the hands of the Minister, which is not that

Sacra-

Sacramentall breaking instituted by Christ:
The Doctor saith that he and some other of
his followers doe break the bread. But I
would demand, if that be the common or-
der of the Kirks, where kneeling is in use.
Next if it be a breaking in the own time,
and place, that is betwixt the thanksgiving,
and giving with these words, *This is my body*,
as Christ gave it. For the Papists have a
kind of breaking after all the words are fi-
nished. For belike it is heresie to breake it
before they have said; *Hoc est enim corpus*
meum.

The second reason disdainfully rejected
by the Doctor, is this, that kneeling hath
brought in a change upon the sacramentall
word, changing the enunciative forme of the
words, *This is my body* into a prayer uttered
in the act of delivery of the elements to the
communicant, *The body of our Lord Jesus, which*
was given for thee, preserve thy body and soule unto
life everlasting. He bringeth in Perkins appro-
ving the matter of Doctrine contained in
this prayer. So doth Perkins many other
heads of doctrine concerning this sacrament.
But where doth Perkins allow this kneeling,
or forming any such doctrinall poynt in a
prayer, to displace the comfortable words
of the promise conceived by Christ himselfe.
He saith, that he and his fellowes utter the
words of promise before the giving of the
bread, and in the act of giving use the pray-
er. But he speaketh without a warrant. Mr.
Galloway sayd, we shal say *Take this as a pledge*
of Christs body, and that, sayd hee, will hold

out all idolatrous thoughts, suppose yee
kneele. And who appoynted that prayer to
be uttered in the act of giving? There is no
such ordinance in our Kirk; The Doctor who
will be conforme to English formalities, be-
fore ever he be enioyned, is not a rule to o-
thers. It is strange, that the worthiest prea-
chers should be persecuted for kneeling be-
fore that all the rest of the formes belonging
to it, or depending on it, be brought in, with-
out the which it cannot bee put in practise.
It agreeth not with the Scottish forme, and
the English hath not yet been prescribed,
But to come to the Doctor his forme. That
is our question; wherefore the vvords of the
promise are not uttered in the act of distri-
buting, when the bread is given to the com-
municant, according to the order of the in-
stitution, as Christ himselfe did, but other
vvords are put in their place. To rehearse
the vvords of the institution, and the words
of promise among the rest, may very well
serve to shew what warrant we have out of
the word to minister that holy action, but
it is not the ministration it selfe, as Christ
ministred that action. I wish it were well
observed, that in the English service-booke
the words of the institution are rehearsed in
forme of a prayer to God, in a continuall te-
nor with the prayer begun in other words
before, just according to the order observed
in the Canon of the Masse. And so the words
are rehearsed not to the communicants as
Christ uttered them to the Apostles, but
prayerwise to God, as the Priest doth when
he

he offereth the sacrifice of the Masse, which is a great absurdity, and abuse of holy Scripture. There the words of promise are uttered in an enunciative forme, but to God; as if there could be no consecration before the rest of the celebration, except these words be pronounced with the prayer. I dare be bold to affirme, that the sacrifice of the Masse had never entred into the Kirk, if this double action, one of consecrating with rehearsal of the words of the institution all at once, without the rites correspondent to the words; another of distributing with other words, had not first entred. The first turned into sacrificing, the second onely remained to be called the sacramental service, or communion.

*Defence of our fourth
Argument.*

THE communicants ought to distribute the elements to others, according to Christs precept, *Divide it amongst you.* This distribution cannot consist with kneeling. He alledgeth Fenner against this distribution, but impertinently: for he speaketh nothing against it. Beza is so farre from denying that precept, Luk. 12. 17. to be meant of the communion cup, that he dare be bold to conjuncture the verses to bee transposed, and that this should bee their order, 16. 19. 20. 17. 18. Luke applieth the protestation, that *Christ will drink no more of the fruit of the vine,* to that same cup which he commanded them to divide amongst themselves. But

that protestation is applied to the communion cup by Matthew and Mark, Math. 26. 28. 29. Mark, 14. 24. 25. It was therefore the communion cup which Christ commanded to divide. He alledgeth against this reason, Piscator in Math. 26. 29. saying, that it is no absurditie to think that Christ made that pro-

(d) Piscator testation twice, once of the paschall cup, in Luk. 17. and again of the communion cup. But writing afterwards upon Luke, he sayth, as being better advised, (d) that there is inversion of order to be observed in Luke, in so farr, as that part of the action, which concerneth the wine, is set downe vers. 17. and 18. before the action concerning the bread. For that these words are to be understood of the cup of the Lords supper, it is cleare by 18. ante sayth he, out of Mark. 14. 24. 25. who subjoyneth actionē circa immediatly to the words pronounced of the cup of panem. Nam the Lords Supper, these words, I will drinke no verba illa de more, &c. No Evangelist maketh mention poculo caræ twice of this protestation of not drinking more; how then can men so boldly conjecture, that it was spoken twice, once of the Paschal cup, and againe of the Eucharistical? Marco, qui Matthew and Mark make this protestation to be spoken but once, and that of the communion cup. Againē, if Christ had made this protestation concerning the paschall cup, how did he keep his promise, if he did drink after the paschall cup, of the Eucharistical cup? Hee sayth Mulculus doubteth, if it may be affirmed, that Christ himselfe did eat and drink, of the sacramentall bread, and wine. But he doubteth without reason. Dōth not Matthew and Mark say, that Christ protested

anent

anent the 'communion cup, that hee would
drink no more of the fruit of the wine after
that. It followeth then that he drank of it.

When the Schoolmen are to prove that
wine is one of the sacramentall elements,
they cannot find a proof in all the foure E-
vangelists, but in this protestation, (e) that hee

will drink no more of the fruit of the vine. Gabriel
Biel groundeth his prooffe on this protestati-
on, as it is set down by Luke, and collecteth,
that neither the wine of apples, nor wine as
it is in the berry, but as it is potable, is the
matter of consecration in this sacrament.

Doth not Musculus himselfe say, (f) I thinke
there is no man will deny, that wine was in the cup.

seeing the Lord sayd, Math. 26. Luk. 22. that hee
would drink no more of the fruit of the wine, &c.

Chrysostome sayth, Ipse quoque bibit ex eo, ne
auditis illis verbis dicerent, Quid? ergo sanguinem

bibimus, & carnem comedimus? & perturbarentur.
He drank also of it, lest hearing these words, they

should say, What? Doe we then drink blood, and
eat flesh? and so should be troubled. And Hierom

saith, (g) that the Lord was conviva, & con-
vivum comedens, et qui comeditur, the banqueter, and

the banquet it selfe; he who did eat, and was eaten.
Whereto should I cite many old testimo-

nies? The two ancient (h) hymnes, are suf-
ficient. He needed not to partake of this

sacrament for himselfe, yet for example sake,
to shew, what others should doe, hee com-

municated with his Apostles. Hee needed
not to have been baptized for himselfe, and

yet he was baptized for the instruction of o-
thers. It becometh him, who inviteth o-
thers

(e) *Lectio 38*
in Canon;
Missa.

(f) *De corpore*
Domini, p.

343. *Existi-*
mo neminem
esse qui neges
vinum in po-
culo fuisse,
cum dixerit
Dominus
Math. 26.

Luk. 22.
haud bibitu-
rum se am-
plius.

Homil. 83. in
Math.

(g) *Ad He-*
dibiam.

(h) *Se tenet*
in manibus, se
cibat ipse ci-
bis.

Se nascens de-
dit socium,
convescens in
edulium.

(i) De cœna
Domini q.
59.

thers to a banquet, to eat with his guests. See further in (1) Bucanus common places. Hee sayth next, that Christ kept his promise, albeit he drank of the cup of the new Testament, after that hee drank of the paschall cup; but letteth us not see, how that should be. He protested, that that passover should be the last, he should eat with them in this mortall life, and this hee performed. He sayth he protested the like of the paschall cup, Luk. 22. and yet drank after that of the communion cup, but that is the very thing we deny: and we have already made manifest, that there was but once protestation made anent the cup, and that it was the communion cup. Further, this protestation was made anent the last cup; but so it is, that the communion cup was the last cup. (k) Christ alluded to the Canon, and custome, whereby it was not lawfull to tast any thing that night after the last cup, the cup of praise. Christ foretelling his death, protests he will drinke no more of it, not that night onely, but not at all in this mortall life.

(k) Beza in
Mark. 14.
25. Alludit
ad morem;
quo nefas e-
rat post po-
culum illud
apolyticon
quicquam
cibi in poste-
rum diem ca-
pere.

(l) Defens.
Harmon. ge-
nerali, cap. 4

Theobaldus Meulchius (1) proveth that this protestation was once onely spoken, and that of the Sacramentall cup, by this same custome of the Iewes. *Inde concludi potest, quod Iudæi panem, & poculum soliti sint distribuere, prorsus in fine Paschatis quibus distribuere quicquam porro gustare ea vespere nefas erat.* He not onely openeth up *Hysteron proteron* Luce continuum, the inversion of order in Luk, and affirmeth the distribution of the cup ver. 17. to be meant of the communion cup;

cup: but also saith, therefore (m) it is likely, yea almost necessary, that the verses 17. and 18. were taken out of the institution of the Supper which followeth, and were placed here by the negligence of Writers. Howsoever it be, if there be not transposition of the verses, there is anticipation in the matter, and purpose it selfe. To the reasons and testimonies before alledged, and in Perth Assembly, and the answer to Doctor Resolutus, I adde onely the testimony of Swarez. (2) Howbeit these words, I will not drink, be related before the consecration, yet it seemeth to be done by way of anticipation: for Matthew and Mark relate them after the consecration. Seeing then we have so many reasons, and such a cloud of witnesses, both of Papists and Protestants, the ancient Fathers, the Schoolemen, and moderne Writers, hat the Precept divide it amongst you, belongeth to the communion cup: Kneeling in the act of receiving the Sacramentall elements cannot have place. It is true, when Christ said, drink yee all of it, hee required that one should not drink out all that was in the cup, as the Priest doth in the Masse, but that every one drink of it. But this precept, divide it amongst you, importeth further, that they should divide, and distribute it amongst themselves. Christ saith not, Let it be divided, or, I will divide it, but, divide yee it amongst your selves. When Christ gave the cup to the Disciple, he took it not from him againe, to deliver it to the next; nor yet did every one set down the cup on the Table, that the next might take it up from the Table, but they

(m) Verosimile igitur est & prope necessarium hos versiculos ex sacrae cœnæ institutione huc esse a scribis trajectos.

(n) Tim. 3. p. 909. Licet a Luca hæc verba, non bibam &c. referantur ante consecrationem, videtur tamen id factum esse per anticipationem. Nam Matthæus & Marcus post consecrationem ista referunt.

they reached the cup to the other. So was the last Paschal cup carried frō hand to hand. This last Paschall cup was changed into the Eucharistical, & when it was changed, it was carried from hand to hand after the same manner. Piscator (o) saith, that it y reached the cup one to another, Bellarmine saith, *Calicem autem non fregit nec divisit ipse discumbentibus, sed dedit integrum ut unus alteri porrigeret, de Eucharist lib. 4. cap. 25.* Christ brake not the cup, nor divided it himselfe to the suters, but gave it whole, that one may reach to another. Swartz saith (p) hee applyed not with his own hand the consecrated bread to the mouthes of the Apostles, but onely offered the plate to them, and they tooke it with their own hands, which is more evident in the cup, in these words, Take it and divide it amongst you. It was carried therefore by the Apostles own hands from one to another. Seeing therefore this is acknowledged, not onely by Calvin, Beza, Piscator, Bellarmine, Swartz, Walterius, and many moe both Popish and Protestant Writers, that, divide it amongst you, concerneth the communion cup, we may not heare without any gaine-saying, that it is indifferent, whether the Ministers or the Communicants, distribute it. For if Christ commanded the cup to be distributed by the Communicants, who hath authority to make it indifferent? But when it is made indifferent to open a doore to superstitious and idolatrous rites to enter in, then is Christ Precept most of all to be observed. If the cup should be divided by the Communicants, then is it like that the bread should

(o) 7ⁿ Math.

26. Ita scilicet ut illud dederit alteri ex proxime accumbentibus actum deinceps singuli ordine alijs cata cuculopositi istud porrexerint.

(p) Tom. 3. p. 861. Quod in calice est evidentijs ex illis verbis.

Accipite & dividite inter vos, fuit ergo per proprias Apostolorum manus ab uno in alium delatus.

should be divided also, seeing Christ said of the bread, *Take yee, eat ye*, in the plurall number. See Piscator in Matth. 26. He saith (q) *It is probable that the Lord brake the bread in two parts, and gave one of them to him that sat nearest to him on the right hand, the other to him, that sat on the left, and that they reached in order to the nearest.* B. 23, Tossanus Hospinianus, Tindall say the like: Moræus, Sibrandus, and others, extend the Precept to the bread also. The reader will finde them already allowed in Perth Assembly, page 41. 42. 43. and the answer to Doctor Resolutus, page 89. Analogie requireth that the Communicants should distribute the bread as well as the cup. And it were not seemely to see the Communicants distribute the cup, and the Minister to goe along to minister the bread. That the cup should be divided by the Communicants is sufficient for our Argument against kneeling. For it excludeth kneeling to receiving the cup. If we may not kneele, when we receive the cup, should we kneele when we receive the bread? I believe that there is no man so absurd, as to think it.

This rite of the Communicants dividing the elements, say we, hath a profitable use, in that it is an interchange amongst the Communicants of tokens of love and amitie. Hee answereth that the Primitive Kneele had another meane, to entertaine love, and friendship, to wit the Love-feasts. Let the taunt which he borrowed from Gardinerus be here retorted against

(q) Probabile est Dominum panem confregisse in duas partes, earumq; alteram dedisse illi qui proximus ipsi accumbebat ad dextram alteram vero illi qui ad sinistram, ut isti deinceps proxime accumbentibus porrigerent, donec singuli particulam sibi decerpissent.

against himselfe. He hath his mind in *patinu*,

(r) De Orig.
error. circa
cœnam sol.

201. Hinc
fortassis ri-
tus ille ad
nos manavit,
qui etiam
hodie in usu
est, ut finitis
Missarū so-
lenniū panes
diuidantur
pauperibus.

ing themselves without feare. They would
have wished that world to last ever. Doeth
he think that the Love-feasts were to re-
maine, as long as the Sacrament of the Sup-
per? They are worn long since out of use,
and no trace of them left, saying that when
the solemnities of the Masse are ended some
bread is distributed to the poore, as Bullin-
gerus reporteth. There is also some foot-
ing of them, as some doe think, at funerals.
Wee point out a rite commanded, which
should endure, seeing it was commanded, he
leadeth us to another temporarie custome.

(f) Anti-
quitatum cō-
vivialium li.
3. cap. 10.
In yis enim
amicitia er-
go humani-
ter se mutuo
excipientes
vini calicem
sibi invicem
porrigebant,
quem Philo-
tesiam appel-
labant, me-

(f) The guests in civill bankers of old, entertai-
ning others courteously reached a cup of wine to o-
thers, which cup they called, Philotesia, Metony-
micallie, because it was a symbole of love and
friendship, which name a man may justly impose to
the cup of the holy Supper of the Lord, saith Stue-
kus. There be other tokens of love in the
Supper it selfe, without the Love-feasts; yet
one token should not juggle out another.
We cannot be too much remembered of this
duty. To drinke of one cup betokeneth
friendship, but to reach the same cup also to
others expresseth this duty in a more lively
manner.

tonymice nimirum, quia symbolum erat amoris, & amicitia, quo
nomine verissime quicquid sacrosanctæ Domini cœnæ poculum
signaverit. See more of this 4. Argum. P. A. page 41. 42. 43.
44. Sol. pag. 8. 9. 10.

*Defence of our fifth
Argument.*

Kneeling, say we, maketh many communions in one Congregation, in the place of one, without any necessity: whereas if wee kepted the right order, wee needed not to doe so. This addition *without any necessity*, he leaveth out, and impugneth the rest. We set to that addition *without any necessity*, because some Congregations are so populous, that they cannot communicate together in one day. Neither doe I thinke that any reasonable man will allow Congregations to be so populous, that they cannot communicate together in one day. That Parishes should be of so large extent, and Congregations so populous, is rather to be reformed as an abuse, then to be allowed. So the addition of that clause, *without necessity*, is onely made in respect of the corruption of the times, not of that order which should be. Our Argument is grounded upon the Apostles precept, 1. Cor. 11. 33. *Wherefore my brethren when ye come together to eat, tarry one for another.* He sayth, that this text is alledged impertinently, because the Apostle by these words would redresse a certaine abuse which was in the Church of Corinth at their love-feasts, willing the rich to tarry for the poore. This is just the answer of the Rhemists upon this place. *Hee exhorteth them say they, to keep their sayd suppers or feasts in unity, peace, and sobriety, the rich expecting the poore.*

Ec. I content me with Fulk his answer. The words that follow (if any be an hungred, let him eat at home) doe declare manifestly, that this expectation, or tarrying one for another, is to receive the communion of the Lords supper, and not to the eating of their love-suppers, which were chiefly to relieve the poore, that were hungry. And bringeth the testimonies of Photius, Chrysostome, Theophilact, Primasius, Ambrose, and Hierome, to this purpose. Ambrose upon this text sayth, He sayth that they must tarry one for another, that the oblation of many may bee celebrated together, and that all may be served, and if any bee impatient, hee may bee fed with earthly bread at home. That you come not together to iudgement, that is, that you keep not the mystery so, as you bee worthy to be reprehended with offence. Hierome or some other under his name, upon this same place sayth, Because none tarried for other, that the offering might be made in common, therefore they came together, not unto sanctification, but unto iudgement. Bilson (i) citeth Augustine to the same purpose: yea Augustine affirmeth, that the Apostle speaking of this sacrament, sayth, For which cause brethren, when you assemble together to eat, expect one another. And againe, (v) he citeth these words of Chrysostome, (x) Paul calleth it the Loyds Supper, which is received in common, with one consent of all assembled together: for untill all communicate and bee partakers of that spiritual food, the mysteries once set forth, are not taken away, but the Priests standing still, stay for all, yea for the poorest of all. The particle therefore knitting he 33. verse to the verses preceeding, maketh it manifest that this precept

(i) Obedience, p. 461.

(v) Obedience p. 494.

(x) Homil. in dictum Pauli oportet hereses esse.

precept is to be referred to the Sacrament.

See more of this point in Perth Assembly (y). (y) P. A.

He saith that we may communicate Sacramentally in divers Parishes, which I thinke
p^{ag}. 44.

no other man ever affirmed. For howbeit they communicate together spiritually, as all Christians doe in the remotest parts of the world, receiving the same spirituall food signified in this Sacrament. Yet they doe not communicate together sacramentally, but who receive the Sacrament together.

Cartwright, writing against the Rhemists, speaketh well to this purpose (z) *The Apo-*

stle, 1. Cor. 10. 17. meaneth the communion of those that in one Congregation, or Church, eat together,

and not of the communion of those that receive the Sacrament in another Church, it is evident, for that

hee placeth the seale of this communion in eating all of one bread, and at one table: whereas they

that communicate in another Congregation, or Church, communicate not of one table or bread with

them that are farre removed, no more then they, that celebrated the Pascheover in divers houses, were

partakers of one Lamb or Kid. For notwithstanding that Christ (who is the Lamb and the Bread)

be but one, yet the outward matter of the Sacrament cannot be one but many, according to the number of places, wherein the Sacrament is ministered.

See more in this place, and in 1. Cor. 10. 17. See also Fulk in these places. And whether

onely the twelve Apostles did communicate at the first Supper, see Cartwright and Fulk

on Matth. 26. 20. This sacramentall communion of one Congregation was expressed yet

more lively, where they dranke of one cup,

C

and

(z) In 1.
Cor. 11. 24.

- (a) Pag. 19. and eat of one bread. The Doctor himselfe alledged before (a) a saying of Musculus, wherein he approved their forme, who used but one cup to signifie the Mysterie of one and the same bloud, wherof all the faithfull do drink alike, yet not condemning the custome of those Churches, which use more cups in the Lords Supper, because of the multitude of the Communicants. Neither do I think on the other side, that others will condemne those who use but one cup. But to place a greater necessitie in one cup, then in one bread, cannot be commended. They had of old, in some Churches, one bread, as well as one cup, one in number, of one masse, *unam unitate numerica sive physica per partium continuationem*, and not one in morall conjunction of many peeces, as many dishes are called but one barker. And this one masse or loafe was unbroken, or cut in peeces till the Minister had first blessed; and for this use they had a knife called *Sacra Lan-*
- (b) Art. 11. *cea*, as Iewell observeth. (b) Where also the Reader may finde many testimonies of this one bread, whereunto I refer. This old custome declareth that sacramentall communion cannot be extended so farre, as the Doctor would have it. See more of this argument in the two former Treatises.
- (c) P. *S*
Pag. 44.
Sol. p. 31.

*Defence of our sixth
Argument.*

Kneeling taketh away the resemblance
of a banquet: because that guests invited
to a banquet kneele not in the act of
banqueting, no not at the banquet of a Prince.
It is called a Supper, and in what respect it
is so called, we have already declared in the
defence of the second Argument. Hee saith
that the analogie betwixt the two feasts
standeth chiefly in eating, drinking and
making merry. If it standeth chiefly and
not onely in these, he reasoneth not to the
purpose. He discourseth upon the perpetu-
all feast which a Christian hath inwardly,
and of that glorious and solemne feasting
in heaven, which is not doubted of. He
saith, that there is great difference betwixt
the spirituall feast of the Sacrament, and a
common corporall banquet; this also is not
denied. He saith, hee who entertaineth us
at this banquet is not a man, or earthly
Prince, but God and man; and his enter-
tainement is spirituall serving for the soule,
that hee giveth himselfe to be the food of
the soule; that Calvin will have us to think
it the Supper of the Lord, and not of men.

All this is true, and hath been already an-
swered in the two former Treatises (d). We
acknowledge both the Giver and the Gift, (d) P. A.
pag. 54.
but beside we acknowledge, that honour Sol. pag. 12.
25. 27.
whereunto hee hath advanced us, that so
great a Prince will entertaine us, not as ser-

vants any longer, but as friends; and this advancement he hath expressed in the Symbolicall Supper, representing our spirituall advancement at the spirituall Supper. Hee who inviteth us, it is true, is not a simple man, like an earthly Prince, but God and Man; but that setteth forth the greatnesse of our dignity. The food whereon we feed is not earthly, it is true, but that ministrereth matter of greater joy to us. But the manifestation of his will and pleasure, is not to be obfuscated in the outward resemblance of the feast, seeing it hath pleased his Majestie to set forth his neerenesse and communion with us by the formes of feasting. In the old Law, the Lord sate between the Cherubines, and eat of the sacrifice (to speak after the manner of men) at his Table, to wit, the Altar, which is so called, Malachi. 1. 2. Ezech. 41. 22. and the people eat of the remaines of the peace-offerings before the Lord at their Tables. Christ God and Man set forth our spirituall feasting, and communion with him in the forme of a feast alway, hee took a part of the Paschall feast and translated it to that use. Whatsoever bee the excellency of the spirituall feast, the outward resemblance thereof being set forth, under the forme of a banquet, both under the Law and under the Gospell, gesture competent to the outward resemblance should be chosen; Kneeling was never used in any nation to this purpose. It is to be observed also, that their Argument smell greatly of reall presence, or of a g-

rative force, and vertue in the Sacraments. They speak, as if we had never received Christs body, but when we receive the Sacrament, and as if Christs body were present. *The holy Mysteries*, saith (e) Iewel, doe not begin, but rather continue and confirme this incorporation. As soon as ever we began to beleve Christs body was given to us. The Symbols when they are added to the Word, while the Mysteries are celebrated, I doubt not, saith (f) Martyr, serve very much for assurance; for they seale the promises. But that they make Christ more present to us, then by Word and Promises doe, I utterly deny. Christ hath set down a forme, how we shoud conforme our gesture at this Feast, to wit, according to the sacramentall manner of taking, which is common to all. The spiritual is proper to the faithfull. See more of this Argument, in the answer to Dr. A. Resolutus.

*Defence of our seventh
Argument.*

THE seventh is almost coincident with the former. So it pleaseth him to divide and rank our reasons. Kneeling is not a fit gesture for a guest invited to a banquet; It obscureth the fellowship, whereunto he is advanced. He perverteth our reason very perversly, against his own conscience, as if wee smelled of Arrianisme; and meant that wee are equals with Christ. A simple reader may smell in this stinking flower of his, grosse popery, and in some

(e) Reply to Harding
art. i. p. 136.

(f) Contra Gardin. col. 735. edit. Basil. 1581.
Tamen illa Christum nobis presentem magis constituere, quam verba, aut promissiones constanter pernege.

(g) pag. 22.
23. 24.

poyns grosser then in a common Papist. Doth every one invited to a Princes table, think himselfe equall with his prince. Hee gathereth as perversly, as it we thought, har

(b) 7ⁿ Mat. wee should not bow our knees to God the
26. Et in no. tacher, or his sonne Iesus Christ: when as
stra. cœna ty- we say, that in the very act of sitting, wee
pus. est futu- are acting the persons of guests, not of sup-
re cœ. 2, ac- plicants: and therfore in the outward re-
mensæ Do- semblance of the teatt, a competent gesture
mini de qua should be used. In time of prayer we act the
Luc. 22. 29 persons of supplicants, and then a fit gesture
O. c. in such an act is used. His own instance re-

(i) Liturg. ce- ureth himselfe. for the 14. Elders, who are
cles. peregr. sayd to fall down before him that sitteth on

(k) ub. 5. de the throne, were seen at the first by Iohn, sit-
rep. eccles. cap- ting about the throne, clothed with white
6 appendice raiments, and crownes of gold; Apoc. 4. He

ad Naz an. sayth that Christ did not institute this sup-

(l) tom. 3. p. per to resemble to us that glory which shall

8. O sacram be revealed. Musculus, whom he often ci-

convivium, teth, but never for the main poyn, sayth, (b)

in quo Chri- And in our supper there is a type of the supper to

stus sumus, come, and of the table of the Lord, whereof Luk. 22.

recolitur me- I appoynt you a kingdom, as my father hath ap-

memoria passio- poynted me: that ye may eat and drink at my ta-

na eius, mens- ble, in my kingdom, and sit on thrones: Iohannes

impletur gra- Alasco (i) often maketh it figurative of that

cia, et futura Supper of glory. The Bishop of Spalato

glorie nobis sayth the like. (k) The Kirk speaketh this

pignus da- way of that mystery, sayth Swarez the Iesuiste,

tur. O sacred banquet, in which Christ is received, the

(m) Part. 3. memory of his passion is celebrate, the mind is filled

quest. 60. with grace, and a pledge of our glory to come is ge-

ant. 3. ven to us. Aquinas sayth, (n) that it is not on-

ly *signum rememorative*, a signe for commemoration of Christs passion, which is past, demonstrative of a present benefit; but also *prognosticum*, id est, *prædictivum* future glorie, foretelling our glory to come. Yet doe we not urge any such type, as if this supper were ordained to that end, or as if it were *typus destinatus*, but onely we count it amongit *typos factos*, because Christ alludeth to it, Luk 22.29. when he promised another feast in heaven. But this all men doe, they make it a figure of a thing present, to wit, of the spirituall feast whereat the soule is feeding, when we partake of the outward symbols. And when we ascribe any signification to our sitting, we say not, that it signifieth our sitting in heaven, but a present rest, and ease of the soule admitted familiarly to the spirituall table, where Christ dineth and suppereth with it. (n)

(n) See more
Sol. 33.34.

Defence of our eighth Argument.

Kneeling before the sacramentall elements is Idolatry. The Papist in his kneeling intendeth to adore Christ bodily present by transubstantiation. The Lutheran, by consubstantiation. The chiefest of our opposites will not have us to be curious to understand the manner of Christs presence. For sayth Hooker, *All things considered, and compared with that successe, which truth hath hitherto had by so bitter conflicts with errors in this poynt, shall I wish that men* Ecc. Pol. l. 8. sect. 67.

would more give themselves to meditate with silence what we have by the sacrament, and lesse to dispute of the manner how? The Bishop of Rochester commendeth the simplicity of the ancients, who disputed not whether Christ were present *Con* sub, in, or *trans* in the supper. What is this but to permit every man to adore upon what intencion he pleaseth. But let the formalist be as free as may be, both of the Popish and Lutheran conceit, yet he is guilty of Idolatry two wayes: First, in that hee kneeleth by direction before a creature. Next, in that he doth kneele for reverence of the sacrament. As for the first, suppose it were true, that they kneeled not for reverence of the symbols, yet there is no difference betwixt them, and the more tollerable sort of Idolaters, Durandus, Holcot, Alphonsus, Mirandula, and the rest in their worshipping of Images. The Doctor sayth here, and againe pag. 55. that they worship not Christ in the bread, nor by the bread, nor the bread it selfe, but directeth the worship of their hearts and bodies immediatly to Christ in the heaven. So sayth that finer sort of Papists, that the crucifix, or any other image is not either the materiall, or formall, the totall, or partiall object of their adoration, but that they direct immediatly their worship to Christ, or the Saint. He bringeth in Martyr, pag 74. saying. (o) For there both by words and visible signes, we are stirred up, both to acknowledge, and to worship Christ himselfe. So sayth Swarez, (p) that the image is not in their opinion, *objectum quod*, the object of their adoration,

(o) *Contra Gardin. par. 3. ibi enim, & verbum, & symbolum, visibilibus excitamur ad Christum ipsum. & agnoscendum, & adorandum.*
 (p) *Tom. 1. disput. 53. 54.*

ration, but onely at the presence and sight of the image, the person represented by the image, is called to remembrance, that the image is an occasion, a mean and signe stirring up a man to adore the principall person represented, and that before it he worshipeth the principall after the same manner, as if he were present. For to direct worship by the image, is in their sence no other thing but to direct it immediately to the principall, before the image, as Bellarmine declareth. (q) The symboles are then to the kneeler, *objectum a quo significative*, sayth Doctor Morton, (r) a signifying object to move the heart, and consequently the body to adoration. No more is the image to these Papists, and their adoration is as abstract from their object, as the kneeler is from his. But, sayth the Doctor, there is difference betwixt images, and the sacramentall symbols. The first, are the invention of men, and forbidden to be used in the worship of God, the other are Gods own ordinance, and commanded to be used in his worship: and confirmeth this his saying with the testimonies of Martyr; which needed not. For we deny not, that they are commanded to be used in Gods worship, as the worship of God is taken in a large sence, for his publick worship, and all the parts thereof, the preaching of the word, ministration of the sacraments, &c. But they were not commanded to be used in the worship of God, as it is taken in a strict sence, *in statu accommodato ad adorationem*, for adoration properly so called, to fall down before them, and worship

Christ

(q) *de mag-*
nib. cap. 10.

(r) *Defence*
pag. 185.

Christ absent. The force of this argument must be this. Whatsoever thing God hath commanded to be used in his publick worship, we may lawfully fall down before it, and worship God by way of adoration properly so called. The sacramentall symbols are commanded to be used in Gods publick worship: Therefore we may fall down before them and worship God. The weakness of this argument is seen in the proposition, which I hope, they will not maintaine. If the Iewes had fallen before every significant object commanded by God to be used in time of divine service, they had continually committed Idolatry.

P. Mariyr professing in Oxford at that time, when kneeling was enjoyned to pacifie the Papists somewhat, who had made some stirres, pretending that the Sacrament was prophaned; was loath, being a stranger, to contradict the prescribed order, and his great friends, who called him to that place. He was forced afterward to defend, what he had written before, and through the importunity of Gardiner his aduersarie, was driven to plaister the English adoration, with such speeches as cannot be well allowed. But even then, when hee was excusing, he was wishing it were not, and was ever warning them of the danger of it; and last, after the experience of the miserable revolt of England, he uttered his minde very freely in an Epistle to the Poles. His testimonies shall be cited in their own place, howbeit in a part, some of them be

be already cited in the answer to Doct. Resolurus, and therefore I proceed. When we alledge a principle out of Perkins, That under the new Testament it is idolatrie to direct our worship to any creature, or place; and in speciall to the bread on the Altar, or in the hand of the Minister: he granteth that Paræus saith in effect as much. But saith he, they speak against the Papists. And so much the worse, say I, if others be guilty of the like fault. It is Papistrie Superstition, and Idolatrie, against which they write, where soever it be. And it is Papistry, Superstition, and Idolatry, whereunto at this present, wee oppose our selves. He saith that Trelcatius writeth, that Christ is to be adored in the Mysteries. But doth hee not tell how? To wit, that the eyes of our faith are to be lifted up to heaven: and the same say we, and do more often inculcate the same, then our opposites. What is this to the prostrating of our bodies, whereof Trelcatius did not dreame? He saith they kneele not as the Papist doth, when the bread is carried in procession, or at the elevation, but when they receive the bread: when as it is notoir that they kneele a long space, before they receive. But let it be so, that they kneele onely when they receive, do they not kneele before it, when they receive it? What matter of the length, or shortnesse of the time, or the act of receiving? If it be unlawfull at any time, even for a moment, or in any act. God never ordained, that any act of his service should be

be performed with any sinne, but rather in case there lay such a necessity on a man, that he cannot performe service to him without sinne, that he should omit his service. For God will not accept of sinne in no case. Next, why will they make scruple to kneele at the elevation, seeing it is then consecrated; it is *objectum a quo significative*; it is in the ministration of the Mysteries, in the time of Gods publick worship. God forbid, that we see the day, wherein he and his fellows may do this without controulement. Suppose the Formalist did not commit Idolatry in bowing before the creature by directiō, yet he committeth idolatry, in that he kneeleth for reverence of the creature. For to kneele before a creature, because of a reverent estimation of it, is to adore it. Because kneeling in religious worship, is ever the gesture of adoration. The formalist kneeleth for reverence of the Sacrament, and the sacramentall actions, taking, eating, drinking. For kneeling is enjoyned in the Kirk of England for reverence of the Sacrament, as the Ministers of Lincolne do prove in their Abridgment. Conformity with England is intended. Therefore kneeling for reverence of the Sacrament is intended. Next kneeling is enjoyned by the act of Perth, for reverent and due regard of so divine a Myserie, as is the Sacrament. Seeing therefore the publick intent is to kneele for reverence of the Sacrament, let no man deceive himselfe with his own private intent; for his act must be interpreted before men

accor-

according to the publicke intent, and before God he shall be guilty, not onely of idolatry, but also of dissimulation. Otherwise he may go to Rome, and take kneeling *Corpus Christi*, out of the Popes own hand. Thirdly, this private intent, must either be for reverence of the Sacrament, or else with prophannesse, and mocking of God. For put the case he be praying in the act of beholding, hearing receiving, eating, drinking; he cannot, nor should not be praying all that time, and performe these actions also, as he ought to do, but sometimes he must have his senses, the members of his body, his mind exercised otherwise then in prayer, to wit, outwardly beholding, taking, eating, drinking; considering inwardly, what these signes, and rituall actions do meane. If in this time he be not praying, and yet kneeling, he is either mocking God, not caring for what respect he kneeleth; or else he kneeleth for reverence of these symbols, and actions, whereabout and wherein he is exercised. But the truth is, that the short ejaculations of the heart, whereof we shal speak afterward may consist with any other actions, either civill or religious: but a set or continued prayer, cannot consist vvith any other actions, either civill or religious, except the gestures of prayer themselves, whether a man stand, sit, or kneele. If a man should be praying on his knees, and in the meane time be eating his meat, vould ye not thinke, that that man vv ere either mocking G O D, or kneeled

kneeled for reverence of his meat, and made an Idoll of it. Ye will say, the case is not alike: for the one is consecrated, and holy, the other is but common. Is not then, the kneeling at the one, and not at the other, for reverence, holiness being the reason, wherefore a man doth kneele. As the King is the person honoured *ut quæ*, and the Royall Dignity is the reason *ut quæ*, whereby he gettieth that honour. So the bread is *objectum quod*, the object which is adored; the holiness of it in that it is consecrated to signify his body, is *quo* the reason, wherefore we kneele before such an object. With what face then, can men say that they kneel not for reverence of the elements, and actions employed about the elements? And this is more then I think a Papist will do to the crucifix: for except he be a praying to Christ before it, he may well bow, but he will not kneele; but here he kneeleth because he believeth he is taking and eating Christs very Body, and so he is consonant to himselfe: the Formalist is not so, but misapplyeth the Popish adoration.

It is objected first, that we uncover our head, why may we not also bow our knees: I answer, that we uncover our heads in the time of this action, as we doe at the hearing of the Scripture read, which we do for veneration, not for adoration. For in this Sacrament CHRISTs own words are heard, and his actions, which were divine and holy, reiterate, and therefore we owe reverence or veneration, but not adoration
for

for reverence, no more then at the hearing of the scripture read. For as Chrysostome sayth, (s) *As the words which Christ spake, are the same which the priests now pronounce, so is it the same oblation, the same baptisme: all things doe so consist together in the faith. And again, (t) that voyce was once pronounced, but it giveth firmesse to this sacrifice through all the tables of the world to this day, and to his coming again. This veneration given to the word, and symbols in so holy an action, redoundeth to God himselfe, or Christ the author and institutor: for they are reverently respected for their sake, and therefore in the reverent usage of them, God is revered. As he that giveth almes to a poore man, is said to doe it to Christ, because he doth it for Christs sake, and honoureth Christ in the poore man. But in adoration God will have no mediate creature to goe betwixt him and the worshipper, howbeit he would pretend, that it is done for his sake, as all Idolaters doe pretend. Kneeling is the gesture of the high and divine worship, which the schoolemen call *cultus latria*, and never given in Scripture to any other, in religious worship: howbeit the Papists have given it also to interiour creatures, which is their vile idolatry. It is not sufficient to say that in our adoration, *non sistendum est in symbolis*, we must not rest upon the symbols, when as our adoration should not light upon the Symbols, or glance at them: for God will not have a glance of his worship bestowed upon any creature. It is objected next, that when the meate is set on our Tables*

(s) 9^m 2^o.
Tim. hom. 2.
Quemadmodum enim verba, quae locutus est Christus eadem sunt, quae sacerdotes nunc quoque pronunciant: ita & oblatio eadem est, eademque baptismi ratio est, adeo omnia in fide consistunt.
(t) Homil. de proditio. Judae. Et vox illa quidem semel dicta est, sed per omnes mentes ecclesiae usque ad hodiernum diem, et usque ad ejus adventum praestat sacrificio primitiam.

bles, vve uncover our heads, and do say grace. I answer, There is a relation here between God and the meat, but not a relation of vvorship, either from the meat to God, as if our vvorship did passe by the meat, and determine in God, or return from God, and determine in the meat. The meat is the subject vvherupon vve desire Gods blessing to be bestowed before vve use it. And therefore vve use the gestures of prayer, vvwhich are used in blessing of other things, that is, vve stretch out our hands over our meat, or use the like demonstrative signe of the creature, vvwhich vve desire God to blesse. Or sometimes vvwithout any such indicant signe, vve expresse our selves with these or the like vvords, *Vpon these thy good creatures, &c.* When persons were blessed, or consecrated, it one, hands vvwere layd upon that one: if many, then the Priest lifted up both his hands, as high as his shoulders, toward or over them, and blessed all together. So is it in the blessing of the meat, or any other creature. There is a relation of a blessing from God to the meat, but not of vvorship from God to the meat. Yea I say further, that in all these blessings, either of persons, or other creatures, vve never read that the blesser kneeled down before the creature, vvhen he blessed, but rather behaved himself as superior unto it, vvwhether it vvwas meat, or drink, or any thing else. I know not one instance to the contrary in the Scripture. Put the case there were, yet after the meat was blessed and sanctified

our common use, in the saking, eating, drink-
ing; what people never so barborous, did
ever kneele? See more of this eighth Argu-
ment in the two former Treatises,

*Defence of our ninth
Argument.*

(u) P. A.
45. 46. 47.
48. 49. 50.
51. Sol. p.
40. 41. 42
43. 33.

WEE say, that we should eschew
all shew of conformitie with the
Papists and idolators. But kneel-
ing in the act of receiving the sacramentall
elements, we are in shew conforme to the
Papists. He telleth us, that we are conforme
with them in many Articles of our faith; we
and they agree in many points of doctrine:
but therein we are conforme to the truth,
and true Apostolicall Church. They pos-
seffe some points of truth which we doe,
as a theife doth a true wans purse; or a Pi-
rate the ship of an honest Marchant. He
saith they kneele for one end, and the Pa-
pist for another. It is not the end, but the
site; not identitie, but likenesse, wherof we
are now speaking. If Christians had deck-
ed their houses with Laurell, and greene
boughes upon the festivall dayes, wheron
the Pagans decked theirs, against the 73.
Canon of the Councell of Bracara, how-
beit there had bene no intention to honour
the gods of the Pagans, yet they could not
have bene excused; because they decked their
houses after the same manner, and at the
same time. We might bring in a multitude
D of

of Iewish and Popish Rites, if the different intention might be a sufficient warrant for us. God made his people as unlike the idolatrous Nations as might be. And so should we be as remote from all Papisticall ceremonies, as may be. P. Martyr in an Epistle to the Polonians sayth, (x) that rite in the administration of the Sacraments is to be embraced, which is most of all, and furthest removed from Papisticall toys, and ceremonies, and cometh nearest to that puritie, which Christ and his Apostles used. Further, we differ not in one generall end, to wit, adoration, but we misapply that which they do. For they are employed about their God, as they think, when they are taking, eating, and drinking. And the Formalist is employed about bread and wine consecrate to an holy use: which are meere creatures even in his own conceit. It is conformity with all the true worshippers of God to kneele in prayer: but not to kneele before the sacramentall elements.

Defence of our tenth Argument.

WEE say that kneeling in the act of receiving the sacramentall elements, suppose it had bene indifferent, or lawfull at the first invention of it, yet seeing it hath bene abused, and polluted with the vilest idolatry, that ever was, it ought to be removed, and no monument thereof left; farre lesse should it be restor-

(x) Loc. com.
p. 1111. In re
tu Sacramen-
torum admi-
nistrandorū
is amplecten-
dus est, qui
fuerit quam
simplicissi-
mus, atque a
Papisticis
nugis &
ceremoniis
maxime re-
mota: & ad
puritatem,
qua Christus
cum Aposto-
lis usus est,
quam pluri-
mum accesserit.

red where it hath bene out of use these
threescore yeares by past, and cast away as a
mentruous cloath. He telleth us that the
Ark was in the Philistines hands: that the
gold, brasle, and Iron of Iericho was taken
into the Lords treasure, and other like in-
stances. The Arke was Gods own ordi-
nance. The silver, the gold, the brasle, were
not idolatrous, but the civill goods of ido-
laters. What God hath instituted, the abuse
of men cannot take away: What belong-
eth to the idolater, not being idolatrous,
nor having state in the idolatrous service,
if it may serve to some necessary, and profi-
table use, may be retained, the abuses being
purged. But kneeling hath state in Gods
service, and both had, and hath state in ido-
latrous service, and is of no necessary use.
When we say that Ezekiah brake the brazen
Serpent in peeces, howbeit it was Gods own
appointed signe, and reserved for a monu-
ment of his mercy 700. yeeres: and that
kneeling was not appointed of God: He
telleth us, we are not bound to imitate the
fact of Ezechias in the particular circum-
stances. It is not from the breaking of it in
peeces, or the manner of abolishing it in
particular, that we do reason, but from the
abolishing of it in generall. So that kneeling
be abolished, and altogether removed out
of that place of divine service, we shall not
contend for the different manner. He saith,
the use of the brasen Serpēt ceased: The use
wherefore it was first instituted ceased, but
the other use, to be a monument of Gods

mercy, ceased not, and might have continued longer, if it had not beene abused. He saith kneeling shall have a profitable use so long as the world standeth. True: but not, kneeling before the elements of the Sacrament in the act of receiving. He saith Ezekiah brake the Idoll, but reserved the burning of Incense to God: So they have broken in peeces, the idoll of Reall presence, but reserved kneeling to Christ. But we say, that he abolished the burning of Incense not simply, for it was a part of Gods service, but burning of Incense before the brasen Serpent. So we crave not kneeling simply to be abolished, but kneeling before the elements in the act of receiving. (y)

(y) P. A.
p. 55. Sol. p.
38.

Defence of our eleventh Argument.

Kneeling in the act of receiving, is dangerous, being an occasion and provocation to idolatry. He sayth, we called it before idolatry, and now onely an occasion or provocation to it. We call it so now in a new argument: first giving and not granting that it were not idolatry. Next, we say, it is dangerous, because it is a provocation to another kinde of idolatry, beside that we spake of before, to wit, the grossest sort of worshipping the transubstantiated bread, or Christ bodily-present. He sayth, we are prone to prophannesse as well as idolatry. But we should not give dangerous provocations, either to the one, or to the other. He sayth,

sayth, the Belgick Kirks making a Canon against kneeling for feare of bread worship, feared where there was no need of feare: for it hath been used in the Kirk of England without any such danger. Mr. Cartwrights report in a matter of fact, will get credit even with his adversaries. He sayth, That in

(2) 1. Part.

p. 164.

divers places the people have knocked on their breasts, and holden up their hands, whilst the Minister was in giving of it, and not onely those who received it, but also those who looked on, and were in the Kirk. Peter Martyr after the revolt of England in Queen Mariés dayes, writing to the Polonian Ministers. (1) Let the evill seed and rotten roots be plucked up at the first beginning: for if they be neglected at the first (I know what I speak) they verruncentur are more hard to be taken away afterward. And sub ipsis initu u to be seen unto, as in the sacraments, so specitijz mala sensu in the Eucharist, that it be most sincerely done, mina & pu- For there are there, beleerve me, pestilent seeds of tres radices, idolatry, which except they bee taken away, the nam si e Church of Christ will never be beautified with pure principio and sincere worship. Let not the sacraments be con- negligentur semned, as empty and voyd signes: and on the other (scio quod Id, let not men give greater honour unto them, then loquo) po- their institution will suffer.

stea multo
difficilius

alluntur, Idque providendam est ut in sacramentis, & precipue in Eucharistia, quam sincerissime fiat. Ibi sint mihi crede idolatrie pestifera semina, quæ porro nisi sublata fuerint ecclesiæ Christi puro necroque cultu nunquam erit ornata. Non contemnantur sacramenta ut inania & vana signa, rursusque non illis plus tribuantur omnes quam ipsorum institutio ferat.

- And before that time, even then when he wrote against Gardiner, he often forewarneth of the danger of it. (b) *Vi, quod mihi videtur, dicam, ad evitanda superstitionum pericula nullum hoc tempore, adorationis externae signa in Eucharistiae perceptione adhiberi, utut non ad symbola panis & vini, sed ad ipsum Christum in caelis regnantem dirigerentur.* Howbeit they should direct their worship, not to the symbols, but to Christ; yet he sayth there is danger of superstition in it. This was the best that ever Martyr could make of it, for thoroughly he could never digest it, and in that Epistle to the Polonians he is more free. Where he testifieth upon his own experience, what such pestilēt seeds of idolatry have wrought. *I know what I spake*, meaning no doubt the revolt of England: and who knoweth if there were the like triall, what the formalists would doe. So howbeit Papists are hardened, and increase to the feeling of all men, yet all the danger is not seen nor felt, till the time of triall come. Beza sayth, (c) *Adoration in the very act of receiving, how dangerous it is, it being that which hath opened an occasion to breadworship, from whence at last Satan cast men down headlong to transubstantiation, the matter of self maketh manifest.* And in his eighth Epistle he sayth, that the event, and lamentable face of the Kirk, doth more then sufficiently teach us, how hurtfull it is; and commendeth these Churches which have abolished it, with no lesse care, then other *aperitas idolomanias* manifest mad idolatry. What need I cite many testimonies, when as all the Di-
- (b) Col. 160
- (c) *Quest. 243. In ipsa panis sumptione adoratione apud nos, tamquam sit periculosa, utpote quae idolatrie occasionem aperuerit, unde tandem homines ad metousian praecipitavit Satan, res ipsa demonstrant.*

vines in well reformed Kirks do think the same; and yet he will say, that the Belgick Kirks feared where there was no need of feare. At last he telleth us, that a Synod in Pole made standing or kneeling indifferent, but sitting they condemned. That Synod was a confused or mixt Synod of sundry sorts of professors, some adhering to the Auguttane confession, some to the Helvetian, some to the Bohemian. Next, they thought that the Arrians had been the first authors of sitting after the reformation, when as both the Scottish and Belgick Churches at that same time, and many yeares before, did use the gesture of sitting, and as worthy a Polonian, as that Church bied in his time, Iohannes Alasco, a Polonian Baron, wrot before the holding of that synod many yeares more amply, and more earnestly for sitting, then any other man els, and did put it in practise in the kirkes, where he bare office. So it was in them a grosse ignorance in a matter of fact, which was so publick in the view of all men. Thirdly, howbeit there was at that mixt Synod a great number of Lutherans, yet they consent with the rest, that no man should be urged to kneel; because it was neither the will of God, nor custome of the purer Kirk to censure, or punish godly men for externall rites. The Lutheran, yee may see, is more favourable in this poynt, howbeit he maintain Christs bodily presence, then these who would seem to be of our own profession. (d) It is to be marked, that in this place the Doctor esteemeth

(d) Sol. pag.

36.

bread-worship to be no error in the foundation.

*Defence of our twelfth
Argument.*

Kneeling in the act of receiving, say we, is will-worship. He sayth it is no part of Gods worship properly; and therefore it cannot be will-worship. This followeth not: for will-worship is of sundry sorts; as when a man inuenteth a new kinde of service to God, which hee never commanded; or when he misplaceth that vvhich God hath commanded, and useth it vvhether he will; or vvhether that, vvhich is not in the own nature vvorship; the user maketh it worship in his own conceit and opinion. Next, it followeth not, because that kneeling is a signe of vvorship, that therefore it is not worship properly; or because sometime we use it, and sometime not: for howbeit it be a signe of the internall adoration, yet is it the matter it selfe of externall adoration; for by it we do not onely signifye the affection of our heart, but also honoureth God, either in secret, or before men. For he that adoreth, honoureth; and we honour God not onely with our spirit, but also with our body. As the Doctor himselfe said before; we direct to God, not onely the worship of our hearts, but of our body: When wee pray without kneeling we give spirituall vvorship, vvithout determination of that particular bodily vvorship at that time: but vvhether we pray kneeling,

vvce

wee cojoyne the bodily , and spirituall worship. Thirdly, it is not the kneeling outward onely , that we call will-worship , but that also wherupon kneeling doth usually attend , that is set and continued prayer. For we say , that in the act of receiving , there is not the proper time and place of set and continued prayer ; wherof we shall intreat in the own place. To pray then , is Gods worship, but to pray in an unfit time, to displace any other part of God worship, is will-worship.

*Defence of our thirteenth
Argument.*

WE E say , that kneeling entred into the Kirk under Antichrist: whether Honorius was the first deviser of it, or not, we regard not as a point materiall. It appeareth that Honorius decreed onely an inclination , or bowing of the superiour bulk of the body at the elevation , but not kneeling. If he ordained so much to be done at the elevation, it is likely that in the act of receiving, kneeling was either then also ordained, or come in a little after. But whether before , or after , is not the chiefe question. It is sufficient , that it was not in use in the Kirk of God for a 1000. years, or before the time at least, when the Antichrist was at his height. For there is not one expresse testimony in all the ancient Writers for kneeling in the act of receiving, except

(e) *P. A.*

p. 60.

(f) *De rep.*

eccel. l. 5. c. 6.

append. ad

Hilarium

numey, 69.

except some counterfeit worke; yea, not so much as in any counterfeit work, so farre as we have yet seen alledged, except in one Cyrillus. The censure of Moulins upon these Catechismes of Cyrillus is marked and set down already in Perth Assembly (e). I adde the censure of the Bishop of Spalato, who saith, (f) that the Catechismes which go abroad under the name of Cyrillus Hierosolymitanus, are to him greatly suspected, for they smell of farre posterior times: and he setteth down the reasons of his judgment. Beza saith, that kneeling in the act of receiving, brought in Popish bread-worship, and transubstantiation, because, it may be, he gave some credit to Cyrillus; but it is very likely that it came in after the opinion of the reall presence, and transubstantiation. For as I have said, there is not a testimony we can heare of, yet alledged for kneeling, within the space of a 1000. yeares. And suppose that kneeling went before the opinion of Reall Presence, or Transubstantiation, yet even then it was, (and no other wayes it could be) the Formalists idolatry, preparing the way to, or rather drawing on the worshipping of Christ as bodily present, or the bread transubstantiated into his body. For I have already declared, that kneeling in the act of receiving, eating and drinking, cannot be but idolatrous. Many grosse corruptions were in the Kirk before the opinion of the Reall Presence, or Transubstantiation prevailed. Seeing then it came in under the Antichrist, whether should we follow

follow the Antichrist, and his Lawes, or
Christ his holy Institutions.

*Defence of our foureteenth
Argument.*

Kneeling in the act of receiving is scandalous to many. He saith that wee ought to do our duty, though men be never so much offended, otherwise the scandall is not given, but taken: our duty is to obey the ordinance of the Kirk made anent kneeling, and not to offend the Kings Majesty. Here ye see first he opponeth offending, that is greiving or displeasing the Kings Majestie, to offending, that is, giving occasion to his brother to fall in a grosse sinne, and so to destroy him, for whom Christ died, so far as in him lyeth. Next suppose that kneeling in the act of receiving the sacramentall elements, were not a sinne, both in disordering the right manner of celebration, and also in that it is idolatry; yet it is a matter of active scandal, in that it hath a shew of evill, and giveth occasion to our brother to fall into that evill, wherof it hath a shew, to wit in bread-worship. For a mans doing is the cause of anothers fall, two wayes, *per se*, of it selfe, or *per accidens*, through the default of another onely, who is ill affected, and taketh occasion to offend, even at good things. The first is active scandal, the second is passive. In the active, sometime there is *intentio operantis*, an intention

(g) *Quando ipsum factū est tale, quod de sui ratione habeat, quod sit inductivum ad peccandum, puta cū aliquis publice facit peccatū, vel quod habet similitudinem peccandi.* 2. 2. quest. 43. art. 1. ad 4.

tion in the doer to draw another to sin :
 Sometime there is without any such inten-
 tion, onely *conditio operis*, such a manner of
 doing, that of it selfe it giveth occasion to
 another to fall. As when a man doth such
 an act, which is an inducement to
 sinne; as when a man committeth pub-
 liquely a sinne, or that which hath the
 shew, or likenesse of sinne, saith Aquinas.
 This shew of idolatry that is in kneeling,
 suppose there were no more, is an induc-
 ment and occasion to others to commit ido-
 latry, & hardneth the Papist in his idolatry;
 It is an active, not a passive scandall. We
 must not omit a necessary duty, suppose o-
 thers unjustly take offence. But kneeling
 in the act of receiving is not a necessary
 duty, but such a deed as is inductive to
 scandall.

The Doctor saith that it is a necessary
 duty to obey the ordinance of our Superi-
 ours, and not to withstand the Authority.
 No man denyeth obedience to be due to
 the Magistrate, or Superiour, suppose others
 should take offence, for that were *materia
 proxima scandali*, the neereft and immediate
 matter of the scandall, to deny that *lege com-
 muni*, by the common law, the law of God
 and men; Magistrates and Superiours
 should be obeyed. But *lege particulari* by a
 particular law made of any particular mat-
 ter, wee are not ever bound to active obe-
 dience; as when he commandeth to sinne,
 or do any thing that hath the shew of sinne,
 or is apt to breed scandall; like as kneel-
 ing

ing in the act of receiving hath proved by the event, or experience both of the ages before and at this present. Neither is in this same case obedience passive denyed; and so the Morall duty of obedience is fulfilled. Daniel would not desist from opening his windowes toward Ierusalem notwithstanding of the Kings edict. The commandment of the Magistrate cannot make a thing, which of it selfe is scandalous, and hurtfull, not to bee hurtfull, but rather by the strength of his authoritie maketh it more scandalous and hurtfull, then it would be. But none of our Formalists will deale in earnest with the supreme Magistrate, and tell him that he committeth active scandall in laying a stumbling block before the people, and therefore sinneth against the LORD. The Nurse that left a knife vvith the child found dead at her returne, could not be free of blame; but the Nurse that layeth downe the knife, is farre lesse to be excused. Ezekias removed a passive scandall, to vvit, the brazen Serpent: For the brazen Serpent vvvas not an active scandall. Seeing therefore there is passive scandall in this kneeling, it is sufficient cause to remove it, suppose there vvwere no active. Will the flattering Formalist then bee instant vvith the Magistrate to remove, or rather not to reinduce this passive scandall, and follow the example of good Ezekias. For this invention of man, hath beene, is, and is still likely to be abused superstitiously, giving and not granting that of it selfe it vvwere not idolatry.

idolatry. But our flatering Formalists care more for their formal coats, then the hazard of many thousand soules. Againe, it is to be remembred, that our superiours cannot free us, or drive us from our oath taken by their own consent. Can they make us swear the one day, and drive us to perjury another day. Last, it is no lawfull ordinance, which was made at Perth, as all our arguments doe evince, neither vvas that meeting a lawfull and free Synod, but a Null and pretended Assembly, vvvhich they are never able, doe vvwhat they can, to defend. The Doctor sayth, he feareth some Ministers do cause the people to take offence. Surely, if they were not constant in their doctrine, and practise, as they have professed these many yeares, they would cause the people take offence at the vvhole doctrine, vvvhich they have taught, and to call it in doubt. Let them alone sayth he, they be blind leaders of the blind. Certainly, vvho vvill be lead by this vvorthy vvork of the Doctors, I affirme he is either a temporizer seeking a cloake for his back-sliding, or els he is blind, led by a blind Doctor: or if he be not blind, he is blinded vvith avarice and ambition, or hath a part of both.

*Defence of our fifteenth
Argument.*

HE maketh us an argument of every thing, wherewith we exaggerate their fault. We say, that Bellarmine argueth
a prior

a priori from the real presence for adoration: and againe, *a posteriori* from adoration for the reall presence. And if it bee lawfull to kneele at the receiving of the sacrament, it is lawfull to kneele before images. He sayth, We may fall down before the symbols, which we have already refused. He sayth, that the Papist worshipeth Christ, & the image with one worship, Christ and the Eucharist as being one. What is that to the purpose, that the idolatry of the Papist, and of the formalist, is not all one in every respect, seeing he misapplieth onely the popish adoration, as I have sayd before. Bellarmine sayth not, that Christ and the image is to be worshiped with one vvorship after one manner: for Christ is to be vvorshiped vvith that high worship called *cultus latriæ*, and that properly, the image of Christ improperly, and *per accidens*; as he that adoreth the King, adoreth him and his purple robe at one time with one vvorship, but after a divers manner. So in the sacrament they adore Christ and the *species* together with the same vvorship, but not after the same manner: for they worship the accidents and species, onely *per accidens*, vvith that vvorship vvwhich they give unto Christ, as in the coadoration of the Kings throne, or his robe, when the King is worshipped: But the formalist kneeleth for reverence of the elements, not *per accidens*, but *per se*, howbeit *propter alium*. Now to kneele for reverence is to adore with that gesture, which in scripture is used in religious and divine vvorship to be given onely to God.

Defence

*Defence of our sixteenth
Argument.*

THe ancient Kirk received not the communion kneeling. Vpon the Lords day it was the custome to stand, and that for a thousand years, even in time of publick prayer. He sayth, that howbeit in time of prayer they stood on the Lords day, to testifie their profession of Christs resurrection, yet at the celebration of the supper they might have kneeled. I ask then, was it more needful to testifie their profession of Christs resurrection in time of prayer, then in the act of receiving the elements. It was that day, that they observed vvith such a rite, because Christ rose on that day, and not a part of the day. The Canons and testimonies for not kneeling on the Lords day, some of them make mention of the time of prayer, because otherwayes at other times they kneeled in time of prayer. Some vvithout a-

(b) Post ves-
pertinum sa-
cerdosum ad
altare in sab-
batho inref-
sum, ex cōsu-
tutine quæ
servatur, ne-
mo genu flec-
sat usque ad
sequentē ves-
peram in die
Dominico.

ny particular mention of prayer time, or more generall. And therefore Zonaras vvriting upon the sixt Councell holden in Trullo, Can. 90. forbidding (b) to bow the knee from the evening service on Saturday, to the next evening tide on the Lords day, sayth, Medio illo tempore nullo modo in genu pro-
mo genu flec-
cumbendum esse denuntiat. It is intimate, that in
that meane time no wayes they should fall on their
knees. When at any time mention is made
of prayer in particular, it is because it vvias
the proper and onely time of kneeling on
other

other dayes. Tertullian likewise sayth, (i) that (i) *De Cord.*
it was counted unlawfull to adore upon *milit. die Do-*
their knees on the Lords day. Iustinus Mar- *minico jeku-*
tyr sayth, that vwhen they vvere beginning *nare, aut de*
this action, they arose, and stood; and vwhen *geniculis a-*
prayer vvas ended, did communicate. The *dorare nefas*
Doctor sayth, it may be, that howbeit they *est.*
arose, and stood on their feet, that they com-
municated kneeling. He hath not so much
as any appearance out of Iustinus vvords,
and yet vvill answer, *It might have been done*
vvith kneeling. Further, they cannot produce
one testimony out of authentick antiquity,
to prove that they kneeled; howbeit vve
produce testimonies for standing, as the
man of vvhom Eusebius maketh mention.
H sayth, howbeit they kneeled not in the
act of receiuing upon the Lords day, yet it
may be that they kneeled on other dayes.
Yet again it may be, and no presumption, no
poothe alledged. Our testimonies are gene-
rall for every day. Eusebius example ma-
keth mention of no day in particular. Chrys-
ostome (i) addeth a reason, vvwhich cannot

(k) *Hist lib.*
7. cap. 8.

(l) *Homil. de*
encens. Ste-
mus tremen-
tes & timidi
demissis ocu-
lu, renata au-
tem anima
gementes, sine
voce, jubilan-
tes corde.

Annon vi-
des eos, qui
sensibili, cor-
ruptibili, tem-
porali &
terreno regi
assistunt, quā
sint imbeci-
les, non lo-
quentes, non
oculis huc et
illuc mitten-
tes, &c.

agree with exception of times. Let us stand
trembling and in feare, with our eyes cast down, in
renewed soule, making a moane without a voyce,
moyning in our heart. See you not these who stand
beside a sensible, corruptible, temporall, earthly
king, how unmoveable and unstirring they are, not
speaking, not casting their eye this way or that way,
&c. Tertullian speaking of some, who
thought, that in case they took the Sacra-
ment upon a fasting day, their fast was bro-
ken: he assureth them on the contrary, that
E their

(m) De orat. their fast was the more solemne. (m) Doth
 cap. 14. Er—the Euch^{ar}ist loose, or rather binde your devotion?
 go devotion Shall not your station be the more solemne, if yee
 Deo obse- stand at the altar of God? For after yee have re-
 quie eucha^{re}stia received and reserved the body of the Lord, both
 iustia resol^u are kept whole, both the participation of
 vit, an magis the Sacrifice, and execution of your devotion.
 Deo obligat^{ur} that is, your fasting, I wish Pleasie, (n) Let
 Nonne solen^{is} be that whereby it should be broken. And Baro-
 nor erit sta- nus by S^{er}mo in Tertullian, sayth, is under-
 tio tua, si ~~et~~ stood h^{is} iunium fasting. Seeing they fasted not
 ad agm Dei on the Lords day, as ye have already heard
 sceleris. No out of Tertullian, it followeth that they
 n^{on} abie^{re} to stood fir the Act of receiving upon other
 co-pore Do- dayes also. The custome of the orientall
 min^{is} et re- Kikes yet not disused to this very same day is
 servat^{ur} a proove sufficient, that in the ancient Kirke
 qu^{is} s^{er}mo^{is} they stood. As for the standing in time of
 est, et p^{ri}va- publick prayer, it was not enioyned as the
 cipatio sacri- fittest gesture of prayer (for upon other daies
 sag^{is} et ex- they kneeled in time of prayer) but onely up-
 on the Lords day were they appoynted to
 (m) Res^{er}ve- stand in prayer, for signification of their joy
 aux theolog. for Christs resurrection. The custome of
 de Bordeaux standing in the act of receiving, was not un-
 versall for a long time: for in many places
 they sate, as well as they stood and went
 so farr in imitation of the first Supper, that
 they communicated at evening, and some at
 termere. This custome was observed by ma-
 ny upon any day. At last it was restrained to
 the anniversary day (called C^{er}na Domini) by
 the third Councell of Carthage, which cus-
 tome yet remaineth at this day, upon that
 anniversary day with the Monkes of Saint
 Bennets

Bennets order. Chrysostome also speaketh (o) *Hom. 27*
 of sitting, when he sayth, (o) *And doist thou* in 1. Cor.
also thou, when thou sittest at the table of the Lord, Et hoc facis;
in that day, wherein thou wast deigned to touch his cum ad Chri-
flth with thy tongue. In Iustinus time, the Dea- sti mensam
 cons dispensed both the bread and the wine, discubueris.
 to the communicants. I would then de- in die illa,
 mand two things: First, if they pronounced qua carnem
 any words, when they delivered the ele- eius lingua
 ments. Long after Iustinus time we know attingere
 they did, when as the Deacon sayd, *The blood* dignatus es
of Christ, the cup of life, which was an abuse au- Sanguis
 thorizing the Deacon to speak to the com- Christi, calix
 municants in that act which was the duty of vita.
 the Minister. If they did not so in Iustinus
 time, did the communicant kneele, when he
 received the elements, from the Deacon,
 without any words pronounced. Next, see-
 ing the Deacons dispensed the elements to
 the communicants, whether before that
 time in the Apostles daies, did the Minister
 dispense the elements out of his own hands,
 or not. It is not likely, if that had been
 their office, that they would have transfer-
 red that office to Deacons. Deacons mini-
 string at tables for the love-feasts, were the
 first employed to minister to the commu-
 nicants sitting at tables in the time of the
 holy action. And from ministering in com-
 mon, they came to particular dispensing to
 every one severally. Thereafter words were
 put in their mouths. At last they were
 made halfe Priests, and got power to teach
 and baptize. To conclude, howsoever the
 ancient kirk kneeled not in the act of recei-
 ving;

ving, their other customes, of standing, and turning the due celebration of the supper into a forme of Iewish sacrificing, as Calvin
 (o) *Instit. lib.* 4. c. 18. f. 11. sayth, (o) and many other corruptions, which entred in very loone, are not to be followed
 (p) *Instit. lib.* 4. c. 17. f. 43. of us. Not long after the Apostles dayes, sayth Calvin, the Supper of the Lord was defiled with
Quam non some rust, but this is the malapertnesse of men, longe ab A- which cannot containe it selfe, but must ever play
posiolorum and toy foolishly in the mysteries of God.
etate cerna

Domini tacta rubigine fuerit; sed isthac scilicet humana confidentia procacitas est, quæ se continere nequit, quin semper in Dei mysterijs luda, & lasciviat.

Defence of our seventeenth Argument.

WEE say that in the act of receiving the Sacramentall elements; we should meditate, and consider the analogie of the signe, and the things signified; attend with our minds, exercise our senses, because of the externall Symbols, and rituall actions, wherabout they are employed; and that it is not a fit time of solemne prayer, and thanksgiving, and consequently that in the act of receiving wee should not kneele. He formeth his second Argument flat contrariwise in this manner. In worshipping God with solemne prayer and thanksgiving, we may lawfully kneele. In the act of receiving the Sacrament wee

worship

worship GOD with solemne prayer and thanksgiving. Ergo, in the act of receiving the Sacrament we may lawfully kneele. We deny the assumption, for the reason already alledged, to wit, that it is not a fit time of solemne prayer and thanksgiving when men have their outward senses, and members of their bodies outwardly, and the powers of their soule inwardly otherwise employed. He proveth his assumption, both here, and in his second Argument after this manner: We should meditate on Christs death; We cannot remember of his death, except we remember also that by his death life commeth unto us; we cannot remember of this, without remembrance of our own misery. The remembrance of our misery minnstreth matter of prayer: Therefore the remembrance of Christs death causeth prayer and thanksgiving; prayer, that by his death we may have life; thanksgiving, for the benefit of redemption. Ye see the whole force of his reason dependeth upon the duty of remembrance of Christs death. Now Becanus the Iesuit saith (q) That divers wayes we may remember of the benefit of redemption, which Christ hath conquered to us by his death. First, in participation of the Sacrament of the Eucharist: Next, in reading the Gospell, where his death and passion is described. Thirdly, at the sight of an Image, which representeth him and his Passion. If therefore at the sight of a Crucifixe the Doctor be put in remembrance of Christs death, should he blot out

(q) De communionē sub
utraq; specie cap. 12.

so good a thing out of his mind? If not, how then can he remember of Christs death, but he must also remember of his miserie, & the benefite gotten by his death, and so burst forth in that very time, and act (for so doth he reason) into prayer, and thanksgiving. To say, that we are forbidden to performe that duty before a crucifix, is to grant that we ought not, and lawfully may not bow down, whensoever we remember of Christs death: And if we may not doe it before a crucifix, by his own grant, we say we may not do it, when there is any other, or the like impediment, as there are many. For howbeit we remember of Christs death when we are most busied in our worldly affaires, yet we must not burst forth into solemne prayer and thanksgiving. When the historie of the Passion is read, we are put in remembrance of his death; and yet in the act of hearing that Hystorie read, we must not burst forth in solemne prayer and thanksgiving, and kneele; but he that hath eares to heare ought to heare. In the act of receiving the sacramentall elements there is likewise impediments, that we may not burst forth in solemne prayer and thanksgiving, and kneele in the very act it selfe of receiving. First, the solemne prayer and thanksgiving can not consist with our other employments of the senses and members of the body, and powers of the soule. Next, we cannot adore before a creature, howbeit consecrated. For as we have layd, the elements are not ordained of God to be used in

statu accommodato ad adorationem, to that ende
 that wee should pray on our knees to God
 before them. When the crucifix, or any o-
 ther image is condemned in the second com-
 mandement, all other creatures for the
 like use are condemned. He saith, if a man
 fall down on his knees where the Idoll is,
 praying against the idolatry committed in
 that place, no man seeing him to take of-
 fence: or if he will turne his face from the
 Idoll he doeth not unlawfully. He doth un-
 lawfully three wayes. First, in that he kneel-
 eth where he needeth not to kneele; for
 kneeling is not a necessary attendant on
 prayer. Next, in that he casteth himselfe in-
 to a temptation wilfully; for the Lord hath
 forbidden worship before Images, not onely
 publique, as if it were to eschew scandall;
 but also in private, because they are dange-
 rous provocations, and enticements to ido-
 latry. If a man should go and lye down in
 the bed with the Harlot, and give her the
 defiance, hee sinneth notwithstanding.
 Thirdly, in so doing, he were but playing
 the foole, and offering but the sacrifice of a
 foole, howbeit he had a Doctors hood. But
 wee will not insist in this instance of his,
 seeing it is not pertinent to our purpose; for
 we are nowv speaking of a publike and vo-
 luntarie vvorship vvithout any protestation
 contrarie to our fact. Against the impedi-
 ment of our senses, and thoughts otherwise
 employed in the act of receiving, he ob-
 jecteth, that the minde may comprehend
 divers things together, and that the heart

may be touched vvith diuers affections at one time. There is no man doubteth of this, it being taken in a right sense. For the soul of man hath sundry powvers and faculties, vvhich concur to the mutuall help of other: one powver removing impediments out of the vvay, that another powver may vvork the ovvn operation the more easily: one power being subordinate to another; and the superiour by some influence applying the inferiour to some worke. Sundry and diuers powers of the soule, and Christian graces, are working together in our religious exercises. But our question is not of one action, or exercise, but whether the same power of the soule at one time, and yet durable, work in diuers actions, and exercises. The Schoolemen dispute concerning Christ, whether in reaching and giving the bread to the disciples, hee did both offer a sacrifice, uttering the words of consecration, as they call them, and reach to them the bread, without any distraction of minde. They say, that not, *Physica duratione. & concomitantia metaphysica, sed morali tantum*, that he first uttered the words and offered, before he gave the bread in their hands, and there was two actions one succeeding another according to physicall consideration, howbeit morally both made but one action. There is in the act of receiving presupposed two actions, one of mentall prayer, another of communicating, that is, taking, eating, drinking. Mentall prayer is either a short ejaculation of the soule, which

which endureth for a moment, and is called by the Divines, *transitoria vel jaculatoria oratio*: or else it is durable and permanent, and is called *oratio continua*. As for the first, there is no action so laborious, or earnest, or worldly, let be religious, but it may consist with it, without distraction of the soule from that action, *Etiam in medio strepitu, & clamore hominum*, In the midst of the noyse and clamours of men, saith (1) Chrysostome. For these momentanean, and transient acts require not permanent attention. Not onely momentanean petitions, but every godly motion, and elevation of the mind, is called by the divines, by this name of mentall prayer. These require not, nor cannot, because of the action with which they are mixed, have geniculation to attend them. For geniculation during for a certaine time must attend upon a permanent action of prayer, and not upon a transient. This transitorie ejaculation may, and doth consist with the taking of the Sacramentall elements, eating, and drinking, seeing it may, and doth consist with all other our actions, even taking, eating, drinking, at our common meales. It is the permanent action of mentall prayer which we deny, can consist with the act of receiving, eating, drinking. The understanding cannot in one continued act be employed in a continued operation, about another action during the same time without distraction, and consequently without unreverent behaviour.

If a man were speaking to a Prince, and
mind

(1) Hom. 7^a.
ad populum.

mind all that time another thing, if it were possible, it were unreuerent behaviour especially if his behaviour were manifested by some outward signes, and employment about other actions, howbeit otherwayes commendable. Our opposites must either confesse, that during that act of receiving, eating, drinking I mean not onely the soule, but one power of the soule, As for example. the intellectuall faculty is exercised by a permanent operation in the action of prayer during the time of their genuculation, and also at the same time, the same faculty of the understanding is exercised by a permanent operation in another action, considering the analogy of things sensible with things invisible, according as the symbols, and every rite ministrereth occasion of meditation, which is the carefull inquisition of the soule. And so confesse that they doe both a thing impossible, and unseemly, or els, that one action succeedeth another, and that genuculation is in respect of both, which is idolatry. Yee suppose the first were supposed to be true and possible, that both the permanent actions must consist together, yet were it also idolatry. For mentall prayer should be concealed at all times in publick, and ought not to be expressed by signes and gestures of prayer outwardly: farre lesse in the place, where it cannot be done without idolatry, or a shew of idolatry: for otherwise the three children might have bowed before the golden image: and Nehemias, when hee stood before the King.

*Defence of our eighteenth
Argument.*

Kneeling bringeth in a private worship, during the time, and act of another worship, which is publick. He telleth us of the abuses of some places. For it is no good, and comely order, that whilst others are communicating apart, and the minister speaking to them, chapters should be read & Psalms sung by the congregation, but the minister ought first to desist from speaking. Walafidus Strabo saith, *(s)* We beleeve, that of old the holy fathers did offer, and communicate with silence; which we yet observe upon Easter Saturday. Howbeit all cannot conveniently communicate at one table, yet when others do communicate, and reap their private and particular fruit, the action should be so minitred, that some publick fruit may in the mean time redound to others who have not, or have already communicated.

(s) De rebus ecclesiast cap 22. Cum ves credamus prius temporibus patres sanctos cum silentio obui se, vel communicasse; quod etiam hactenus in Sabbatho sancto pasche observamus.

*Defence of our nineteenth
Argument.*

WE are bound by our oath to keepe the purity of our profession, both in doctrine, and policie, and to withstand to the uttermost, all corruptions damned by our Kirk, either in the first or second confession of faith, the first or second book of discipline, acts of parliament, and acts of generall assemblies, under the danger of

of damnation in the fearfull day of iudgement. Let the temporizer and the formalist keep the next Christmas with this fearfull execration. Discipline is changed, and the forme of government to another kinde of policy, and not acts of circumstances onely. Our oath was not made of matters indifferent, but of things unlawfull; and suppose indifferent, yet not as indifferent, but as scandalous, dangerous, and apt to provoke to superstition and idolatry. The oath is handled already at large in Perth Assembly.

*Answer to his ten Arguments
for kneeling*

I Have no will to spend another sheet of paper on them, therefore I will be short. To the first: All our former arguments proue this kneeling not to be indifferent. Sitting we think not so necessary, as that there could not be a sacrament without it, but to the due ministration of the sacrament we think a table-gesture necessary. As for the gesture of sitting, we think that the example of the first supper, seconded with the practise following, should be æquivalent to a precept, seeing it is so taken in other matters of policie. Howbeit to sit be not in the Categorie of actions, yet it necessarily presupposeth local motion, which is an action. And Christ cōmanding them in these words, *Do this*, comprehended not onely deeds, but also words, and the whole forme of the celebration,

lebration, as if he had sayd, celebrate this
 supper, as yee see we have now celebrated
 it. The rest of the confirmation of this Ar-
 gument hath been answered in the defence of
 our first, second and sixth arguments, and the
 two former treatises. His second and third
 arguments are answered in our seven-
 teenth argument. The sensible manner of
 giving in the sacrament, is one of the chiefe
 reasons, wherefore we should not kneele;
 least we seem to adore the means when vve
 are in the very use of them. And as for the
 spirituall manner, we receive these same
 things in the word one by one, as vve do in
 the sacrament, howbeit outwardly the
 vword sound generally to the eares of all.
 We uncover our heads, when the scripture
 is read not for adoration, but veneration,
 whereby vve discern betwixt it, and the
 voyce of men. To kneele vwhen the vword
 is read, is to adore in the time of another
 action, and confound them, or rather to om-
 mit the duty of hearing vvith such attention,
 as we are bound to; or else to adore the
 word it selfe, which is idolatry, or else to
 mock God, and his publique worship. Of
 this we have spoken sufficiently in the seven-
 teenth Argument. Yea, further, suppose it
 were lawfull to kneele at the hearing of the
 Word read, it is not lawfull to bow down
 before a creature in the Sacrament. To the
 fourth Argument: a table-gesture we hold
 necessary to the due ministration, suppose
 sitting in speciall be not so necessarie, it fol-
 loweth not kneeling is as necessarie, as sit-
 ting,

ting, because kneeling is no table-gesture; the rest is answered in our 1. 2. 6. 7. Arguments. His fifth Argument is answered in our 1. and 2. Arguments. His six is answered in our first Argument. The gesture of Christ at preaching and prayer, was variable; and therefore we may vary. His gesture at the Paschall suppers, and at this last Supper was one, and in a rituall action requiring some competent gesture. The seventh Argument is answered in our 16. Argument. That the Ancients changed sitting into standing, was done without good reason: Their liberty of changing that, and many other things in the Sacrament, drew on at last the abominable Masse, and the breadie God. If the Church now should take greater liberty, and change from sitting or standing to kneeling, as they did, it were but to proceed from worse to worse. For there is great difference betwixt change of one Table-gesture into another, and a change of a Table-gesture into a gesture of adoration. The eighth Argument is answered in the 8. 9. 10. 11. Arguments. To the ninth, Howbeit the Lutheran thinketh that Christ is not to be adored in the bread, out of the use of the Sacrament; yet in the use and in the act of receiving, they kneele; because of their opinion of the reall presence of Christs body. The rest hath bene answered in our 11. Argument. The tenth doeth not conclude for kneeling, and impugneth sitting as though urged necessarily by us. When as we onely ground upon Christ, and his Apostles sitting, and

and other rites, the necessitie of a Table: gesture, not to the essence of a Sacrament, but to the due ministration of that action: that the rest of the commanded rites may be performed, which cannot be performed with a gesture of adoration. Sitting wee thinke ought not to be changed, no not into standing, without some waighty consideration of some urgent occasion, because it was the gesture of Christ, his Apostles, and the Apostolicall Kirkes; it is the ordinary gesture of guests at feasts, and resembleth best the familiar access of the soule to the spirituall Table. As for types of our Supper in heaven, and sitting at it, we

have answered in the defence of the seventh Argument.

WHat I have omitted in the answer to his ten Arguments, is either not worthy of answer, or already answered in the preceeding defence, as also in the two former treatises.

FINIS.

Pag. 2. in the Marg. *quesque* for *quousque*.
pag. 6. at for as. pag. 31. obtused for obscured.
pag. 60. or for are.